arXiv:1606.07451v1 [math.PR] 23 Jun 2016

On the Boltzmann Equation with Stochastic Kinetic Transport: Global Existence of Renormalized Martingale Solutions

Samuel Punshon-Smith* and Scott Smith†

University of Maryland, College Park

June 27, 2016

Abstract

This article studies the Cauchy problem for the Boltzmann equation with stochastic kinetic transport. Under a cut-off assumption on the collision kernel and a coloring hypothesis for the noise coefficients, we prove the global existence of renormalized (in the sense of DiPerna/Lions [17]) martingale solutions to the Boltzmann equation for large initial data with finite mass, energy, and entropy. Our analysis includes a detailed study of weak martingale solutions to a class of linear stochastic kinetic equations. This study includes a criterion for renormalization, the weak closedness of the solution set, and tightness of velocity averages in L^1.

*punshs@math.umd.edu
†ssmith88@math.umd.edu

Contents

1 Introduction **3**
- 1.1 Statement of the main result . . . 5
- 1.2 Overview of the article . . . 9

2 Preliminaries **14**
- 2.1 Notation . . . 14
- 2.2 Basic properties of the collision operator . . . 14
- 2.3 Formal A priori estimates . . . 15
  - 2.3.1 Moment Bound . . . 15
- 2.4 Entropy Bound . . . 16
  - 2.4.1 Dissipation Bound . . . 17

3 Stochastic Kinetic Transport Equations **17**
- 3.1 Weak martingale solutions . . . 17
- 3.2 Stability of weak martingale solutions . . . 20
- 3.3 Renormalization . . . 22

4 Stochastic Velocity Averaging **28**
- 4.1 L^2 Velocity Averaging . . . 30
- 4.2 Proof of Main lemma . . . 31

5 Approximating Scheme **34**

6 Compactness and Preliminary Renormalization **41**
- 6.1 Tightness of renormalized quantities . . . 42
- 6.2 Proof of Proposition 6.1 . . . 48
- 6.3 Proof of Corollary 6.3 . . . 49

7 Analysis of the Renormalized Collision Operator **50**
- 7.1 Proof of Proposition . . . 55

8 Proof of Main Result **56**

Appendices **59**

1 Introduction

The Boltzmann equation

$$\begin{aligned} &\partial_t f + v \cdot \nabla_x f + \operatorname{div}_v(\mathcal{X} f) = \mathcal{B}(f,f), \\ &f|_{t=0} = f_0, \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

on $[0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ is a nonlinear integro-differential equation describing the evolution of a rarefied gas, dominated by binary collisions, and in the presence of a external force field $\mathcal{X}$. The function $f(t,x,v) \in \mathbb{R}$ describes the density of particles at time $t \in [0,T]$, position $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, with velocity $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$, starting at $t = 0$ from an initial density $f_0(x,v)$. The nonlinear functional $f \mapsto \mathcal{B}(f,f)$, known as the collision operator, acts on the velocity variable only, and accounts for the effect of collisions between pairs of particles; it will be described in more detail below.

Several studies have been conducted regarding the well-posedness of the Cauchy problem for the Boltzmann equation (1) with a fixed (deterministic) external force, for instance [4, 7, 19, 43]. In general, the external force field $\mathcal{X}$ may depend on $(t,x,v) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$. Such external forces may arise when considering the influence of gravity such as in the treatment of the Bernard problem [20, 3]. In fact, many external forces are not fixed, and are instead coupled with the density f in a self consistent way. This is the case, for example, with the Vlasov-Poisson-Boltzmann and Vlasov-Maxwell-Boltzmann equations (see [12, 35] and references therein for more details on these systems).

This article focuses instead on the Cauchy problem for the Boltzmann equation with *random* external forcing. In particular, we are interested in the following SPDE

$$\begin{aligned} &\partial_t f + v \cdot \nabla_x f + \operatorname{div}_v(f \sigma_k \circ \dot{\beta}_k) = \mathcal{B}(f,f), \\ &f|_{t=0} = f_0, \end{aligned} \tag{SB}$$

where $\{\beta_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ are one-dimensional Brownian motions and $\{\sigma_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ are a family of vector fields $\sigma_k : \mathbb{R}^{2d} \to \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\operatorname{div}_v \sigma_k = 0$. An implicit summation is taken over $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and the expression $\operatorname{div}_v(f\sigma_k \circ \dot{\beta}_k)$ denotes a transport type multiplicative noise, white in time and colored in (x,v), where the product $\circ$ is interpreted in the Stratanovich sense.

Physically, we view the quantity

$$(t,x,v) \mapsto \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \sigma_k(x,v)\dot{\beta}_k(t)$$

as an environmental noise acting on the gas. In the absence of collisions, all particles evolve according to the stochastic differential equation

$$\mathrm{d}X_t = V_t \mathrm{d}t, \quad \mathrm{d}V_t = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \sigma_k(X_t,V_t) \circ \mathrm{d}\beta_k(t), \quad (X_0,V_0) = (x,v) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}, \tag{2}$$

and are only distinguished from one another according to their initial location in the phase space. Let $\Phi_t(x,v)$ be the stochastic flow associated with the SDE (2). The Stratanovich form of the noise and the fact that $\mathrm{div}_v \sigma_k = 0$ ensures that the flow Φ_t is volume preserving (with probability one). The density of the collision-less gas is then given by $f_t(x,v) = f_0(\Phi_t^{-1}(x,v))$ and evolves according to the free stochastic kinetic transport equation

$$\begin{aligned} &\partial_t f + v \cdot \nabla_x f + \mathrm{div}_v(f \sigma_k \circ \dot{\beta}_k) = 0, \\ &f|_{t=0} = f_0. \end{aligned}$$

The presence of collisions interrupts the stochastic transport process. In the low volume density regime, binary collisions are dominant and can be described by the Boltzmann collision operator $\mathcal{B}(f,f)$. The stochastic Boltzmann equation (SB) accounts for both stochastic transport and binary collisions. In fact, formally (SB) can be written in mild form,

$$f_t = f_0 \circ \Phi_t^{-1} + \int_0^t \mathcal{B}(f_s, f_s) \circ \Phi_{t-s}^{-1} \mathrm{d}s.$$

The stochastic Boltzmann equation (SB) can be interpreted as the so-called Boltzmann-Grad limiting description of interacting particles subject to the *same* environmental noise. In the deterministic setting, the Boltzmann-Grad problem has been studied extensively in the literature (see [25] for a recent review). In the stochastic setting, the Boltzmann-Grad problem has (to our knowledge) not yet been studied. However, a mean field limit to the Vlasov equation with stochastic kinetic transport has been shown recently by Coghi and Flandoli [14].

To our knowledge, this is the first study to obtain mathematically rigorous results on the Boltzmann equation with a random external force. However, a number of results on the *fluctuating Boltzmann equation* are available in the Math and Physics literature [8, 24, 37, 41, 39, 40, 42]. In particular, the articles of Bixon/Zwanzig [8] and Fox/Uhlenbeck [24] outline a formal derivation of Landau and Lifshitz's equations of fluctuating hydrodynamics [34], from the fluctuating linear Boltzmann equation. The connection with macroscopic fluid equations arises from studying the correlation structure of the fluctuations at the level of the kinetic description. A more rigorous treatment of the fluctuation theory for the Boltzmann equation and its connection to the Boltzmann-Grad limit is given by Spohn [41, 39, 40].

Although our perspective differs from that of [24] and [8], we do expect to obtain various stochastic hydrodynamic equations (with colored noise) in different asymptotic regimes, using a Chapman-Enskog expansion and the moments method of Bardos/Golse/Levermore [6]. In fact, one of the original motivations for this article was to understand which of the common forms of noise in the stochastic fluids literature can be obtained by considering fluctuations of the stochastic kinetic description relative to an equilibrium state. This will be addressed in detail in future works.

The goal of this article is to investigate global solutions to (SB) starting from general 'large' initial data $f_0 \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$. If the noise coefficients σ are identically zero, then this problem has already been addressed in the seminal work of DiPerna/Lions [17], where existence of renormalized

solutions is proved. Our work is heavily inspired by [17], relying on a number of their insights together with various classical properties of the Boltzmann equation. Rather than give a detailed review, in the next subsection we will explain how these observations from the deterministic theory lead to the notion of renormalized martingale solution to (SB) in the present context. Finally, we should mention that our initial motivation for the choice of noise was heavily inspired by a number of interesting works on stochastic transport equations (see for instance [16, 22, 23, 21]). Finally, we should mention the work [11] on the 2-d stochastic Euler equations with a very similar noise to the one in this paper.

1.1 Statement of the main result

Let us begin by discussing the basics of the Boltzmann equation and introduce the analytical framework for the problem. We refer the reader to the books [12, 13] and the excellent set of notes [29] for a comprehensive introduction to the Boltzmann equation, as well as the review [45].

The collision operator $\mathcal{B}(f,f)$ describes the rate of change in particle density due to collisions. It contains all the information about collision rates between particles with different velocities. More precisely, it is defined through its action in v as

$$\mathcal{B}(f,f)(v) = \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} (f'f'_* - ff_*)(v,v_*,\theta)b(v-v_*,\theta)\mathrm{d}\theta\mathrm{d}v_*, \tag{3}$$

where f_*, f', and f'_* are shorthand for $f(v_*)$, $f(v')$, and $f(v'_*)$, while (v',v'_*) denote pre-collisional velocities

$$\begin{cases} v' = v - (v-v_*)\cdot\theta\,\theta \\ v'_* = v_* + (v-v_*)\cdot\theta\,\theta. \end{cases}$$

Note that (v',v'_*), parametrized by $\theta\in\mathbb{S}^{d-1}$, are solutions to the equations describing pairwise conservation of momentum and energy,

$$\begin{aligned} v'+v'_* &= v+v_* \\ |v'|^2+|v'_*|^2 &= |v|^2+|v_*|^2. \end{aligned}$$

The collision kernel $b(v-v_*,\theta)\geq 0$ is determined by details of the inter-molecular forces between particles and determines the rate at which particles with relative velocity $v-v_*$ collide with deflection angle $\theta\cdot(v-v_*)/|v-v_*|$. In this article, for technical reasons and simplicity of exposition, we restrict our attention to bounded, integrable kernels, though we intend to investigate (in a future work) the possibility of treating more singular kernels as in Alexandre/Villani [1] and other works. Our assumption on the collision kernel is the following:

Hypothesis 1.1. *The collision kernel $b(z,\theta)$ depends solely on $|z|$ and $|z\cdot\theta|$ only, and satisfies,*

$$b\in L^1(\mathbb{R}^{2d}\times\mathbb{S}^{d-1})\cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{2d}\times\mathbb{S}^{d-1}).$$

Since the nonlinear term $\mathcal{B}(f,f)$ is quadratic in f, further properties of the operator must be exploited in order to obtain a priori bounds. A classical observation is that the symmetry assumptions on the collision kernel b imposed in Hypothesis 1.1 and the definition of (v',v'_*) imply that for each smooth $\xi:\mathbb{R}^d\to\mathbb{R}$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\xi(v)\mathcal{B}(f,f)\mathrm{d}v=\frac{1}{4}\iiint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}\times\mathbb{S}^{d-1}}(f'f'_*-ff_*)(\xi_*+\xi-\xi'_*-\xi')\,b(v-v_*,\theta)\,\mathrm{d}\theta\mathrm{d}v_*\mathrm{d}v. \tag{4}$$

Any quantity $\xi(v)$ such that $\xi_*+\xi=\xi'_*+\xi'$, is called a collision invariant. For any collision invariant $\xi(v)$, (4) implies that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\xi(v)\mathcal{B}(f,f)(v)\mathrm{d}v=0.$$

As a result of the definition of (v',v'_*), the quantities $\{1,\{v_i\}_{i=1}^d,|v|^2\}$ are collision invariants. Therefore, multiplying both sides of (SB) by a collision invariant and integrating in v, the collision operator vanishes

$$\partial_t\Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\xi(v)f\,\mathrm{d}v\Big)+\mathrm{div}_x\Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}v\xi(v)f\,\mathrm{d}v\Big)=\Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\nabla\xi(v)\cdot\sigma_k f\,\mathrm{d}v\Big)\circ\dot\beta_k. \tag{5}$$

In the case that $\xi(v)=1+|v|^2$ in (5), one can close on estimate on $\xi(v)f$, provided we have the following coloring hypothesis on σ:

Hypothesis 1.2. *For each $k\in\mathbb{N}$, the noise coefficient $\sigma_k:\mathbb{R}^{2d}\to\mathbb{R}^d$ satisfies* $\mathrm{div}_v\sigma_k=0$. *In addition, the sequence $\sigma=\{\sigma_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ obeys:*

$$\|\sigma\|_{\ell^2(\mathbb{N};L^\infty_{x,v})}=\Big(\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}}\|\sigma_k\|^2_{L^\infty_{x,v}}\Big)^{1/2}<\infty \tag{H1}$$

$$\|\sigma\cdot\nabla_v\sigma\|_{\ell^1(\mathbb{N};L^\infty_{x,v})}=\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}}\|\sigma_k\cdot\nabla_v\sigma_k\|_{L^\infty_{x,v}}<\infty. \tag{H2}$$

More generally, in Section 2 we show that Hypothesis 1.2 implies that a solution f to (SB) satisfies the following formal a priori bound

$$\mathbb{E}\|(1+|x|^2+|v|^2)f\|^p_{L^\infty_t(L^1_{x,v})}\le C_p, \tag{6}$$

for all $p\in[1,\infty)$ and some positive constant C_p (depending on p). In addition, a further $L\log L$ estimate on f is available due to the entropy structure of (SB). To obtain this, let $\Gamma:\mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R}$ be a sufficiently smooth function, which we will refer to as a renormalization. Since we use Stratanovich noise and $\mathrm{div}_v\sigma_k=0$, if f is a solution of (SB), then formally $\Gamma(f)$ should satisfy:

$$\begin{aligned}&\partial_t\Gamma(f)+v\cdot\nabla_x\Gamma(f)+\mathrm{div}_v(\Gamma(f)\sigma_k\circ\dot\beta_k)=\Gamma'(f)\mathcal{B}(f,f),\\&\Gamma(f)|_{t=0}=\Gamma(f_0).\end{aligned} \tag{RSB}$$

In particular, taking $\Gamma(f) = f\log f$ in (RSB) and integrating in v yields

$$\partial_t\Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f\log f\,\mathrm{d}v\Big) + \mathrm{div}_x\Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} v\, f\log f\,\mathrm{d}v\Big) = -\mathcal{D}(f), \tag{7}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{D}(f) &\equiv \frac{1}{4}\iiint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}\times\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} d(f)(t,x,v,v_*,\theta)\, b(v-v_*,\theta)\,\mathrm{d}\theta\mathrm{d}v_*\mathrm{d}v,\\ d(f) &\equiv (f'f'_* - ff_*)\log\left(\frac{f'f'_*}{ff_*}\right) \geq 0.\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

Equation (7) describes the local dissipation of the entropy density $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f\log f\mathrm{d}v$. The quantity $\mathcal{D}(f)$ is referred to as the entropy dissipation, and inherits non-negativity from $d(f)$. Since $f\log f$ is unsigned, we cannot immediately use (7) to obtain an $L\log L$ bound. However, combining this with (6), in Section 2 we show that for all $p\in[1,\infty)$

$$\mathbb{E}\|f\log f\|^p_{L^\infty_t(L^1_{x,v})}, \quad \mathbb{E}\|\mathcal{D}(f)\|^p_{L^1_{t,x}} \leq C_p. \tag{9}$$

Although the a priori bounds (6) and (9) provide a useful starting point, they are unfortunately insufficient to give a meaning to $\mathcal{B}(f,f)$ in the sense of distributions. For bounded kernels, one can obtain an L^1_v estimate on $\mathcal{B}(f,f)$,

$$\|\mathcal{B}(f,f)\|_{L^1_v} \leq C\|f\|^2_{L^1_v}.$$

However, since $\mathcal{B}(f,f)$ acts pointwise in x, the operator $f\mapsto\mathcal{B}(f,f)$ sends $L^1_{x,v}$ to $L^0_x(L^1_v)$ (a measurable function in x). A key observation of DiPerna and Lions [17] is that the renormalized collision operator $f\to(1+f)^{-1}\mathcal{B}(f,f)$ is better behaved. More precisely, the following inequality holds:

$$\|(1+f)^{-1}\mathcal{B}(f,f)\|_{L^1_{t,x,v}} \lesssim \|\mathcal{D}(f)\|_{L^1_{t,x}} + \|f\|_{L^1_{t,x,v}}. \tag{10}$$

Thus, if f satisfies the a priori bounds (6) and (9), the quantity $(1+f)^{-1}\mathcal{B}(f,f)$ is well defined in $L^{\infty-}(\Omega;L^1_{t,x,v})$. Hence, it becomes feasible to search for solutions satisfying (RSB) in the sense of distributions for a suitable class of renormalizations. Towards this end, we make the following definition:

Definition 1.3. Define the set of renormalizations $\mathcal{R}$ to consist of $C^1(\mathbb{R}_+)$ functions $\Gamma:\mathbb{R}_+\to\mathbb{R}$ such that the mapping $x\mapsto(1+x)|\Gamma'(x)|$ belongs to $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+)$.

It is important to keep in mind that this class of renormalizations excludes the possibility of choosing $\Gamma(f)=f$ or $\Gamma(f)=f\log f$ and therefore extra care must be taken to obtain the a priori estimates (6) and (9) above.

We note that for analytical purposes, relating to martingale techniques, it is often more convenient to work with (RSB) in Itô form. Thus, we introduce the matrix

$$A(x,v) = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \sigma_k(x,v)\otimes\sigma_k(x,v),$$

and define the operator

$$\mathcal{L}_\sigma \varphi = \mathrm{div}_v(A\nabla_v\varphi).$$

Using the divergence free assumption for each σ_k, the random transport term in (RSB) can be converted to Itô form via the relation

$$\mathrm{div}_v(\Gamma(f)\sigma_k\circ\dot{\beta}_k) = \mathcal{L}_\sigma\Gamma(f) + \mathrm{div}_v(\Gamma(f)\sigma_k\dot{\beta}_k).$$

We are now ready to define our notion of solution for (RSB).

Definition 1.4. A density f is defined to be a renormalized martingale solution to (SB) provided there exists a stochastic basis $(\Omega,\mathcal{F},\mathbb{P},(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t=0}^T,\{\beta_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}})$ such that the following hold:

1. For all $(t,\omega)\in[0,T]\times\Omega$, the quantity $f(t,\omega)$ is a non-negative element of $L^1_{x,v}$.
2. The mapping $f:[0,T]\times\Omega\to L^1_{x,v}$ defines an $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t=0}^T$ adapted process with continuous sample paths.
3. For all renormalizations $\Gamma\in\mathcal{R}$, test functions $\varphi\in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$, and times $t\in[0,T]$; the following equality holds $\mathbb{P}$ almost surely:

$$\begin{aligned}\iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}}\Gamma(f)(t)\varphi\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}v &= \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}}\Gamma(f_0)\varphi\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}v\\ &+\int_0^t\iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}}[\Gamma(f)v\cdot\nabla_x\varphi+\Gamma'(f)\mathcal{B}(f,f)\varphi]\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}v\mathrm{d}s\\ &+\frac{1}{2}\int_0^t\iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}}\Gamma(f)\mathcal{L}_\sigma\varphi\,\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}v\mathrm{d}s+\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}}\int_0^t\iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}}\Gamma(f)\sigma_k\cdot\nabla_v\varphi\,\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}v\mathrm{d}\beta_k(s).\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

4. For all $p\in[1,\infty)$ there exists a positive constant C_p such that:

$$\mathbb{E}\|(1+|x|^2+|v|^2+|\log f|)f\|^p_{L^\infty_t(L^1_{x,v})},\quad \mathbb{E}\|\mathcal{D}(f)\|^p_{L^1_{t,x}}\le C_p. \tag{12}$$

Remark 1.5. In light of the estimate (10), the estimates in condition 4 of Definition 1.4 ensure that the weak form (11) is well defined and the stochastic integral is a continuous-time martingale.

At present, we require a further technical hypothesis on σ and $\sigma \cdot \nabla_v \sigma$. This is related to the regularity needed on σ to renormalize a linear, stochastic kinetic transport equation, a crucial procedure in our analysis. This is discussed in more detail in Section 1.2 below.

Hypothesis 1.6. *There exists an $\varepsilon > 0$ such that:*

$$\|\sigma\|_{\ell^2(\mathbb{N};W^{1,2+\varepsilon}_{x,v})} = \Big(\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \|\sigma_k\|^2_{W^{1,2+\varepsilon}_{x,v}} \Big)^{1/2} < \infty \tag{H3}$$

$$\|\sigma \cdot \nabla_v \sigma\|_{\ell^1(\mathbb{N};W^{1,1+\varepsilon}_{x,v})} = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \|\sigma_k \cdot \nabla_v \sigma_k\|_{W^{1,1+\varepsilon}_{x,v}} < \infty. \tag{H4}$$

The main result of this article is the following global existence theorem:

Theorem 1.7. *Let $\{\sigma_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a collection of noise coefficients satisfying Hypotheses 1.2 and 1.6. Assume that the initial data $f_0 : \mathbb{R}^{2d} \to \mathbb{R}_+$ satisfies $(1+|x|^2+|v|^2+|\log f_0|) f_0 \in L^1_{x,v}$. Then there exists a renormalized martingale solution to* (SB)*, starting from f_0.*

Now we proceed to an overview of the article, addressing the main difficulties overcome and the relation of our work to the existing literature on kinetic equations and stochastic PDE's.

1.2 Overview of the article

Our analysis begins with formal a priori estimates which point to the natural functional framework for (SB). Namely, in Section 2 we show that under the coloring Hypotheses (H1) and (H2), solutions to (SB) formally satisfy

$$\mathbb{E}\|(1+|x|^2+|v|^2+|\log f|) f\|^p_{L^\infty_t(L^1_{x,v})} \leq C_p,$$
$$\mathbb{E}\|\mathcal{D}(f)\|^p_{L^1_{t,x}} \leq C_p.$$

With these formal a priori bounds at hand, the remainder of the paper splits roughly into two parts. In Sections 3 and 4, we analyze linear stochastic kinetic equations, while Sections $5-8$ are devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.7.

In Sections 3 and 4 we move to a detailed discussion of stochastic kinetic equations of the form

$$\begin{aligned} &\partial_t f + v \cdot \nabla_x f + \mathrm{div}_v(f \sigma_k \circ \dot{\beta}_k) = g, \\ &f|_{t=0} = f_0. \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

A probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ is given in advance and $f_0 \in L^1_{x,v}$ is a deterministic initial condition, while g is a random variable with values in $L^1_{t,x,v}$. We will focus on so-called weak martingale solutions to (13). Roughly speaking (see Definition 3.1 of Section 3.1 for the precise meaning), these

are $L^1_{x,v}$ valued stochastic processes satisfying (13) weakly in both the PDE and the probabilistic sense. In this context, probabilistically weak means that the Brownian motions $\{\beta_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ and the filtration $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t=0}^T$ are not fixed in advance, but found as solutions to the problem, along with f.

For convenience we introduce the following language to refer to solutions of (13), we say that: *f is a solution to the stochastic kinetic equation driven by g and starting from f_0, relative to the noise coefficients σ and the stochastic basis* $(\Omega,\mathcal{F},\mathbb{P},(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t=0}^T,\{\beta_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}})$. In the case that the coefficients σ, the filtration $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t=0}^T$, and the Brownian motions $\{\beta_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ are implicitly known, we may omit them from the statement, saying instead: *f is a solution to the stochastic kinetic equation driven by g and starting from f_0*.

A key workhorse for our analysis is a stability result (Proposition 3.5) for weak martingale solutions to stochastic kinetic equations. In the deterministic setting, this simply corresponds to the observation that the space of solutions to linear, kinetic equations is closed with respect to convergence in distribution. More precisely, if

$$\begin{aligned}&\partial_t f_n + v\cdot\nabla_x f_n = g_n \quad \text{in} \quad \mathcal{D}'_{t,x,v},\\ &f|_{t=0} = f_0^n,\end{aligned}$$

and $\{(f_n,g_n,f_0^n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges to (f,g,f^0) in $[\mathcal{D}'_{t,x,v}]^3$, then it easily follows from the linear structure of the equation that

$$\begin{aligned}&\partial_t f + v\cdot\nabla_x f = g \quad \text{in} \quad \mathcal{D}'_{t,x,v},\\ &f|_{t=0} = f_0.\end{aligned}$$

In the stochastic framework, an additional subtlety arises. Namely, one should distinguish between the closure of stochastically strong solutions, where a stochastic basis has been fixed, and stochastically weak solutions, where each solution comes equipped with its own stochastic basis. For a fixed stochastic basis $(\Omega,\mathcal{F},\mathbb{P},(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t=0}^T,\{\beta_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}})$ and noise coefficients $\{\sigma_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$, one can use the linearity of $f\to \mathrm{div}_v(f\sigma_k\circ\dot\beta_k)$ together with the method of Pardoux [38] to make a direct passage to the limit on both sides of the equation. However, for stochastically weak solutions, the Brownian motions are not fixed, so the contribution of $(f,\beta_k)\to\mathrm{div}_v(f\sigma_k\circ\dot\beta_k)$ becomes nonlinear. A martingale method is used to overcome this difficulty and this is detailed in Proposition 3.5.

Section 3.3 is devoted to renormalizing weak martingale solutions to stochastic kinetic equations. This will prove to be a crucial property in the final stages of the existence proof. Formally, if f satisfies (13) and $\Gamma:\mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R}$ is a smooth renormalization, then $\Gamma(f)$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}&\partial_t\Gamma(f) + v\cdot\nabla_x\Gamma(f) + \mathrm{div}_v(\Gamma(f)\sigma_k\circ\dot\beta_k) = \Gamma'(f)g,\\ &\Gamma(f)|_{t=0} = \Gamma(f_0).\end{aligned}$$

However, since we are working with weak martingale solutions to (13), this formal calculation may fail if the individual σ_k are too rough. This observation is in the same spirit as the classical results of Di'Perna and Lions [18] regarding renormalized solutions to deterministic, linear transport equations. In particular (to our knowledge), the coloring hypotheses (H1), (H2) are insufficent.

Our strategy in Section 3.3 uses the method of DiPerna and Lions. Given a smooth renormalization Γ with bounded first and second derivatives, we begin by smoothing a solution f to (13) in the (x,v) variables with mollifier η_ε. The regularity improvement allows us to renormalize the equation by Γ at the expense of a remainder $R_\varepsilon(f)$ comprised of commutators and double commutators of $\sigma_k \cdot \nabla_v$ and η_ε,

$$[\eta_\varepsilon, \sigma_k \cdot \nabla_v](f), \quad \Big[[\eta_\varepsilon, \sigma_k \cdot \nabla_v], \sigma_k \cdot \nabla_v\Big](f).$$

If $f_t \in [L^p_{x,v}]_{\mathrm{loc}}$ with probability one, the double commutator will vanish (as $\varepsilon \to 0$) strongly in L^1 provided that $\sigma_k \in [W^{1,\frac{2p}{p-1}}_{x,v}]_{\mathrm{loc}}$ and $\sigma_k \cdot \nabla_v \sigma_k \in [W^{1,\frac{p}{p-1}}_{x,v}]_{\mathrm{loc}}$. However, as a consequence of Itô's formula, the remainder $R_\varepsilon(f)$ involves squares of the commutator $[\eta_\varepsilon, \sigma_k \cdot \nabla_v](f)$. Due to the limited integrability and regularity of f, we require $p \geq 2$ and $\sigma_k \in [W^{1,\frac{2p}{p-2}}_{x,v}]_{\mathrm{loc}}$ for this contribution to vanish. Based on this method of proof, we are presently unable to treat the case $p \in [1,2)$. Assuming $f \in L^p(\Omega \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^{2d})$ for $p \geq 2$, we are able to show that weak martingale solutions to (13) are renormalized provided

$$\sigma \in \ell^2(\mathbb{N}; W^{1,\frac{2p}{p-2}}_{x,v}) \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma \cdot \nabla_v \sigma \in \ell^1(\mathbb{N}; W^{1,\frac{p}{p-1}}_{x,v}). \tag{14}$$

In the case that $f \in L^{\infty-}(\Omega \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^{2d})$, the conditions (14) become assumptions (H3) and (H4) on the noise coefficients. We believe these results are consistent with the work of Lions/Le-Bris [10] on deterministic parabolic equations with rough diffusion coefficients. There should also be a connection with the more recent work of Bailleul/Gubinelli [5].

Section 4 concerns the subtle regularizing effects for stochastic kinetic equations. These are captured by studying the velocity averages of the solution, and have a long history in the deterministic literature [9, 27, 28, 31] as well as several more recent results in the SPDE literature [15, 26, 36]. Since equation (13) is of transport type, without more information on g, one does not expect to obtain any further regularity on the solution f than is present in the initial data f_0. However, in view of the deterministic theory it is natural to expect a small gain in the regularity of velocity averages $\langle f, \phi \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f \phi \mathrm{d}v$, where $\phi \in C^\infty_c(\mathbb{R}^d_v)$ is a test function in velocity only. Using a Fourier method of Bouchut/Desvillette [9], we prove that if f is a weak martingale solution to (13) and $f, g \in L^2(\Omega \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^{2d})$, then $\langle f, \phi \rangle$ enjoys the following regularity estimate,

$$\mathbb{E}\|\langle f, \phi \rangle\|^2_{L^2_t(H^{1/6}_x)} \leq C_{\phi,\sigma}\Big(\|f_0\|^2_{L^2_{x,v}} + \mathbb{E}\|f\|^2_{L^2_{t,x,v}} + \mathbb{E}\|g\|^2_{L^2_{t,x,v}}\Big).$$

Combining this with a standard control on oscillations in time, one expects to obtain a form of strong compactness on the velocity averages. To formulate this directly in terms of f rather than its velocity averages, we introduce a topological vector space $L^p_{t,x}(\mathcal{M}^*_v)$ consisting of the space of $L^p_{t,x}$ functions taking values in the space of Radon measures $\mathcal{M}^*_v$ on $\mathbb{R}^d_v$ endowed with it's weak-$\star$

topology. The topology is designed so that sequential convergence in $L^p_{t,x}(\mathcal{M}^*_v)$ corresponds exactly to strong $L^p_{t,x}$ convergence of each sequence of velocity averages. We prove a characterization of compact sets in $L^p_{t,x}(\mathcal{M}^*_v)$ in the appendix. Using the regularity gain in L^2, we exhibit a sufficient criterion for a sequence $\{f_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of weak martingale solutions to a stochastic kinetic equation driven by $\{g_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ to induce tight laws on $[L^2_{t,x}(\mathcal{M}^*_v)]_{\text{loc}}$. However, for applications to Boltzmann, one is mostly interested in the case where $\{g_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is only known to be uniformly bounded in $L^1(\Omega\times[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^{2d})$, due to the very limited control provided by the a priori bounds on the renormalized collision operator $f\to\Gamma'(f)\mathcal{B}(f,f)$. The criteria for tightness in $L^1_{t,x}(\mathcal{M}^*_v)$ is the main result of Section 4. As in the deterministic setting (see [27, 28]), there is no easily quantifiable regularity gain for $f,g\in L^1(\Omega\times[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^{2d})$, making the analysis more involved. At present, we can only treat well-prepared sequences of approximations for which the solution f_n and the source g_n are somewhat better behaved for fixed $n\in\mathbb{N}$. This is captured by Hypothesis 4.1.

At this point in the article, we have completed our analysis of the linear problem and proceed to apply our results from Section $3-4$ in the context of (SB). This begins in Section 5 with a construction of a sequence of approximations $\{\tilde{f}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ satisfying a stochastic transport equation driven by a truncated collision operator

$$\mathcal{B}_n(f,f)=\frac{\widehat{\mathcal{B}}_n(f,f)}{(1+n^{-1}\langle f,1\rangle)}.$$

This truncation was introduced in [17] to make $\mathcal{B}_n(f,f)$ Lipshitz in $L^1_{t,x,v}$ while preserving it's conservation properties. After smoothing the noise coefficients and activating only finitely many Brownian motions, we obtain existence by way of the stochastic flow representation of Kunita [33], in combination with a fixed point argument. The main subtleties in comparison to the deterministic theory are due to the fact that the flow map is not explicit. To obtain the a priori bounds

$$\sup_n\mathbb{E}\|(1+|x|^2+|v|^2+|\log\tilde{f}_n|)\tilde{f}_n\|^p_{L^\infty_t(L^1_{x,v})}\leq C_p,\quad \sup_n\mathbb{E}\|\mathcal{D}_n(\tilde{f}_n)\|^p_{L^1_{t,x,v}}\leq C_p,$$

we require asymptotic growth estimates for the stochastic flow and a stopping time argument. A similar difficulty arises in the work of Hofmanova [30]. An additional difference with the deterministic theory is that we do not prove that our approximations are of Schwarz class in position and velocity. Instead, we use our renormalization lemma to establish the moment and entropy identities used in Section 2.

Let us now discuss the main features of the existence proof for Theorem 1.7 and some of the main difficulties. The main goal in sections $6-8$ is to extract an appropriate limit point f on a well prepared stochastic basis $(\Omega,\mathcal{F},\mathbb{P},(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t=0}^T,\{\beta_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}})$ and verify that f is indeed a renormalized martingale solution to (SB). This requires a somewhat involved combination of the renormalization and stochastic velocity averaging lemmas together with the general line of arguments introduced by DiPerna and Lions [17] and a later work of Lions [35]. The argument requires a careful interpretation in the stochastic framework. We study the laws of the sequence $\{\tilde{f}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and use

the velocity averaging and renormalization lemmas to show they are tight on $L^1_{t,x}(\mathcal{M}^*_v) \cap C_t([L^1_x]_w)$. A generalization of the Skorohod theorem due to Jakubowski [32] and Vaart/Wellner [44] gives a candidate limit f, which we endeavor to show is a renormalized martingale solution to (SB). The Skorohod theorem allows one to gain compactness of the nonlinear drift terms at the expense of the noise terms. Indeed, additional oscillations are introduced in the noise terms after switching probability spaces as $\mathrm{div}_v(\sigma^n_k f_n \dot{\beta}_k)$ is replaced by $\mathrm{div}_v(\sigma^n_k \tilde{f}_n \dot{\tilde{\beta}}^n_k)$, at which point we are setup to apply our weak stability result. However, this is done in a somewhat indirect way.

The procedure of identifying f with a solution of (RSB) requires two conceptually different steps. First, in Section 6 we fix a bounded renormalization Γ_m which converges to the identity as $m \to \infty$. With m fixed, we check the criterion necessary to apply our weak stability result to the sequence $\{\Gamma_m(f_n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$. This sequence is also shown to induce tight laws on $L^1_{t,x}(\mathcal{M}^*_v) \cap C_t([L^1_x]_w)$. The stability result implies its limit point $\overline{\Gamma}_m$ is a solution to a stochastic kinetic equation with a driver $\mathcal{B}_m$. To show this requires analysis of the laws induced by the sequence of renormalized collision operators $\{\Gamma'_m(f_n)\mathcal{B}_n(f_n, f_n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$.

At this stage, we do not yet have any sort of closed evolution equation for $\overline{\Gamma_m(f)}$. Indeed, it is unclear the relation between $\overline{\Gamma}_m$ and $\mathcal{B}_m$. Hence, our next step is to pass $m \to \infty$ and hope to obtain a closed evolution equation in the limit. As a result of the initial renormalization procedure $\overline{\Gamma_m(f)}$ converges strongly to f in $L^\infty_t(L^1_{x,v})$, $\mathbb{P}$ almost surely. Unfortunately, as $m \to \infty$ one does not have any good control on $\{\mathcal{B}_m\}_{m\in\mathbb{N}}$ in any space of distributions (only in the topology of measurable functions, which does not play well with the weak form). On the other hand, we do have control of $\{(1+\overline{\Gamma_m(f)})^{-1}\mathcal{B}_m\}_{m\in\mathbb{N}}$. Hence, the strategy is to renormalize again, this time with $\log(1+z)$, and apply again our stability result in the limit $m \to \infty$.

Section 7 is dedicated to analysis of the renormalized collision operator $\mathcal{B}_m$. As in the deterministic setting, we are able to obtain a pointwise (in Ω) continuity result

$$\frac{\mathcal{B}_n(f_n, f_n)}{1+\langle f_n, 1\rangle} \to \frac{\mathcal{B}(f,f)}{1+\langle f, 1\rangle} \quad \text{in} \quad L^1_{t,x}(\mathcal{M}^*_v),$$

as a consequence of the velocity averaging lemmas. Following the strategy in [35] and [29], we are able to conclude that

$$\frac{\mathcal{B}_m}{1+\overline{\Gamma_m(f)}} \to \frac{\mathcal{B}(f,f)}{1+f} \quad \text{in} \quad L^2(\Omega; [L^1_{t,x,v}]_w),$$

allowing us to apply again the stability result.

We are then able to deduce that $\log(1+f)$ is a solution to a stochastic kinetic equation driven by $(1+f)^{-1}\mathcal{B}(f,f)$. Roughly speaking, the final step is verify the renormalized form of (SB) with an arbitary renormalization. Since $\log(1+f) \in L^{\infty-}(\Omega \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^{2d})$, the conditions on the noise coefficients (H3) and (H4) are exactly such that the renormalization Lemma 3.8 applies. This completes the proof.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Notation

To simplify the appearance of the function spaces used in this paper, we will use a number abbreviations. The notation $L^q_t(L^p_{x,v})$ denotes the space $L^q([0,T];L^p(\mathbb{R}^{2d}))$, and $L^p_{t,x,v}$ is short for $L^p([0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^{2d})$, with similar notation for Sobolev spaces. A Banach space B endowed with its weak topology is denoted $[B]_w$, and the space of weakly continuous functions from $[0,T]$ to B will be written as $C_t([B]_w)$. Finally, $[L^p_{t,x,v}]_{\text{loc}}$ denotes the space of locally integrable functions endowed with the natural topology of locally convex seminorms.

For a given probability space $(\Omega,\mathcal{F},\mathbb{P})$ and a Banach space B, we will denote by $L^p(\Omega;B)$ the measurable maps (random variables) from $\mathcal{F}$ to the Borel sigma algebra on B with p^{th} integrable norm. The space $L^{\infty-}(\Omega;B)$ consists of random variables belonging to $L^p(\Omega;B)$ for all $p\in[1,\infty)$.

2.2 Basic properties of the collision operator

In this section, we recall some basic properties of the collision operator $f\to\mathcal{B}(f,f)$ (defined in (3)) which will be used throughout the article. A more in-depth discussion can be found in [17]. To begin, we note that the collision operator may be split into gain and loss terms

$$\mathcal{B}(f,f)=\mathcal{B}^+(f,f)-\mathcal{B}^-(f,f),$$

with

$$\mathcal{B}^+(f,f)=\iint_{\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} f'f'_*b(v-v_*,\theta)\mathrm{d}\theta\mathrm{d}v_*,\quad \mathcal{B}^-(f,f)=f(\overline{b}*f),$$

and $\overline{b}$ defined by

$$\overline{b}(z)=\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} b(z,\theta)\mathrm{d}\theta.$$

The following inequality due to Arkeryd [2] relates the positive and negative parts of the collision operator through the entropy dissipation. Namely, for $K>1$ and $f\in L^1_v$, it holds

$$\mathcal{B}^+(f,f)(v)\le K\mathcal{B}^-(f,f)(v)+\frac{1}{\log K}\mathcal{D}^0(f)(v), \tag{15}$$

where $\mathcal{D}^0(f)$ is defined by

$$\mathcal{D}^0(f)=\frac{1}{4}\iint_{\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} d(f)b(v-v_*,\theta)\mathrm{d}\theta\mathrm{d}v_*.$$

Note that the quantity $\mathcal{D}^0(f)$ is *not* the entropy dissipation $\mathcal{D}(f)$ as defined in (8), but is instead related to $\mathcal{D}(f)$ by an integration in v,

$$\mathcal{D}(f)=\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\mathcal{D}^0(f)\mathrm{d}v.$$

2.3 Formal A priori estimates

In this section, we will derive formal a priori estimates on the stochastic Boltzmann equation (SB) with $\{\sigma_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ satisfying (H1) and (H2) and initial data f_0 satisfying

$$\|(1+|x|^2+|v|^2+|\log f_0|)\,f_0\|^p_{L^1_{x,v}} < \infty.$$

Specifically we will see that under these assumptions, there exists a positive constant $C \equiv C_{p,\sigma,T,f_0}$, depending on p, $\{\sigma_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$, T, and f_0 such that

$$\mathbb{E}\|(1+|x|^2+|v|^2+|\log f|)\,f\|^p_{L^\infty_t(L^1_{x,v})} \le C.$$

In addition the entropy dissipation $\mathcal{D}(f)$ satisfies

$$\mathbb{E}\|\mathcal{D}(f)\|^p_{L^1_{t,x}} \le C. \tag{16}$$

These a priori estimates are completely natural in the context of the deterministic Boltzmann equation and correspond to the physical assumptions of finite mass, momentum, energy, entropy, and entropy production (see for instance [13] or [29]).

Throughout the argument C will denote a positive, finite constant that depends on p, $\{\sigma_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$, T and f_0. It may change from line to line, and even within a line.

2.3.1 Moment Bound

We begin by showing that

$$\mathbb{E}\|(1+|x|^2+|v|^2)\,f\|^p_{L^\infty_t(L^1_{x,v})} \le C, \tag{17}$$

for $p > 2$. To this end, we multiply the Boltzmann equation by $(1+|x|^2+|v|^2)$ in Itô form and integrate over $[0,t]\times\mathbb{R}^d_x\times\mathbb{R}^d_v$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2}\iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}}(1+|x|^2+|v|^2)\,f_t\,\mathrm{d}v\mathrm{d}x &= \frac{1}{2}\iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}}(1+|x|^2+|v|^2)\,f_0\,\mathrm{d}v\mathrm{d}x\\ &+\int_0^t\iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}}\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}}|\sigma_k|^2 f_s\,\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}v\mathrm{d}s+\int_0^t\iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}}\Big(\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}}(\sigma_k\cdot\nabla_v\sigma_k)+x\Big)\cdot v\,f_s\,\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}v\mathrm{d}s\\ &+\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}}\int_0^t\Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}}v\cdot\sigma_k\,f_s\,\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}v\Big)\mathrm{d}\beta_k(s).\end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

Applying Cauchy-Schwartz to the time integral the following estimate readily follows,

$$\begin{aligned}&\Big|\int_0^t\iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}}\Big(\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}}(\sigma_k\cdot\nabla_v\sigma_k)+x\Big)\cdot v\,f_s\,\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}v\mathrm{d}s\Big|^p\\ &\qquad\le C\|\sigma\cdot\nabla_v\sigma\|^p_{\ell^1(\mathbb{N};L^\infty_{x,v})}\int_0^t\|(1+|x|^2+|v|^2)\,f_s\|^p_{L^1_{x,v}}\mathrm{d}s,\end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

and similarly

$$\left| \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} |\sigma_k|^2 f_s \,\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}v\mathrm{d}s \right|^p \leq C \int_0^t \|(1+|x|^2+|v|^2) f_s\|_{L^1_{x,v}}^p \,\mathrm{d}s. \tag{20}$$

For the stochastic integral term in (18), the BGD (Burkholder-Davis-Gundy) inequality yields

$$\mathbb{E}\left| \sup_{r\in[0,t]} \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \int_0^r \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} v\cdot\sigma_k \, f_s \,\mathrm{d}v\mathrm{d}x \right) \mathrm{d}\beta_k(s) \right|^p \leq \mathbb{E}\left(\int_0^t \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \sigma_k \cdot v f_s \,\mathrm{d}v\mathrm{d}x \right)^2 \mathrm{d}s \right)^{p/2}.$$

Therefore, after another application of Cauchy-Schwartz to the time integral, we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left| \sup_{r\in[0,t]} \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \int_0^r \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} v\cdot\sigma_k \, f_s \,\mathrm{d}v\mathrm{d}x \right) \mathrm{d}\beta_k(s) \right|^p \\ \leq C\|\sigma\|^p_{\ell^2(\mathbb{N};L^\infty_{x,v})} \int_0^t \mathbb{E}\|(1+|x|^2+|v|^2) f_s\|^p_{L^1_{x,v}} \,\mathrm{d}s \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

We may now combine estimates (19), (20) and (21) with (18) to obtain

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\sup_{r\in[0,t]} \|(1+|x|^2+|v|^2) f_r\|_{L^1_{x,v}} \right)^p \leq C + C\int_0^t \mathbb{E}\left(\sup_{r\in[0,s]} \|(1+|x|^2+|v|^2) f_r\|_{L^1_{x,v}} \right)^p \mathrm{d}s.$$

Whereby Grönwall's lemma gives (17).

2.4 Entropy Bound

Next, we show that

$$\mathbb{E}\| f\log f \|^p_{L^\infty_t(L^1_{x,v})} \leq C.$$

This estimate, as in the deterministic case, is comprised of two parts, control of the entropy $f\log f$ from above by the entropy dissipation (7) and control of $f\log f$ from below using estimates (17) and a Maxwellian. Specifically, integrating the entropy dissipation law (7) in $[0,t]\times\mathbb{R}^d_x$ gives the $\mathbb{P}$ almost sure identity, for each $t\in[0,T]$,

$$\int_{R^{2d}} f_t \log f_t \mathrm{d}v\mathrm{d}x = \int_{R^{2d}} f_0 \log f_0 \mathrm{d}v\mathrm{d}x - \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathcal{D}(f_s)\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}s, \tag{22}$$

and since $\mathcal{D}(f)\geq 0$, this yields the classical entropy inequality,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} f_t \log f_t \mathrm{d}v\mathrm{d}x \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} f_0 \log f_0 \,\mathrm{d}v\mathrm{d}x.$$

Using this and standard estimates from kinetic theory (see [13]), we obtain $\mathbb{P}$ almost surely

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} f_t|\log f_t|\mathrm{d}v\mathrm{d}x &\leq \int_{R^{2d}} f_t \log f_t \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}v + 2\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} (|x|^2+|v|^2) f_t \mathrm{d}v\mathrm{d}x + 2\frac{\log e}{e}\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}(|x|^2+|v|^2)}\,\mathrm{d}v\mathrm{d}x \\ &\leq \| f_0 \log f_0\|_{L^1_{x,v}} + C\|(1+|x|^2+|v|^2) f_t\|_{L^1_{x,v}} + C.\end{aligned}$$

Applying the previous estimate on $(1+|x|^2+|v|^2)f$ to the above inequality gives the desired estimate of $f\log f$.

2.4.1 Dissipation Bound

Finally with regard to the entropy dissipation estimate (16), observe that equation (22) also implies the $\mathbb{P}$ almost sure bound

$$\|\mathcal{D}(f)\|_{L^1_{t,x}} \leq \| f\log f\|_{L^1_{t,x,v}} + \| f_0 \log f_0\|_{L^1_{x,v}},$$

from which the estimate (16) clearly follows.

3 Stochastic Kinetic Transport Equations

In this section, we assume that a probability space $(\Omega,\mathcal{F},\mathbb{P})$ is given, together with a deterministic initial condition $f_0 \in L^1_{x,v}$ and a random variable $g \in L^1(\Omega; L^1_{t,x,v})$. Moreover, we have a collection of noise coefficients $\{\sigma_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ satisfying the coloring Hypothesis 1.2. We analyze properties of solutions to stochastic kinetic equations of the type

$$\begin{aligned}&\partial_t f + v\cdot\nabla_x f + \mathrm{div}_v(f\sigma_k\circ\dot{\beta}_k) = g \\ &f\,|_{t=0} = f_0,\end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

where solutions are understood in the weak martingale sense, given precisely in Definition 3.1 below.

3.1 Weak martingale solutions

Definition 3.1 (Weak Martingale Solution)**.** A process $f:[0,T]\times\Omega\to L^1_{x,v}$ is a weak martingale solution of the stochastic kinetic transport equation driven by g with initial data f_0, provided the following is true:

1. For all $\varphi\in C^\infty_c(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$, the process $\langle f,\varphi\rangle:\Omega\times[0,T]\to\mathbb{R}$ admits $\mathbb{P}$ a.s. continuous sample paths. Moreover, f belongs to $L^2(\Omega; L^\infty_t(L^1_{x,v}))$.

2. There exists a collection of Brownian motions $\{\beta_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ and a filtration $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t=0}^T$ where the filtration $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t=0}^T$ is generated by the $[L^1_{x,v}]_w$ valued processes $(f_t)_{t=0}^T$, $(\int_0^t g_s ds)_{t=0}^T$ and each Brownian motion $(\beta_k(t))_{t=0}^T$.

3. For all test functions $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$, the process $(M_t(\varphi))_{t=0}^T$ defined by

$$M_t(\varphi) = \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} f_t\varphi \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}v - \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} f_0\varphi \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}v - \int_0^t \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} f(v\cdot\nabla_x\varphi + \mathcal{L}_\sigma\varphi) + g\varphi \,\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}v\mathrm{d}s \quad (24)$$

is an $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t=0}^T$ martingale. Moreover, its quadratic variation and cross variation with respect to each β_k are given by:

$$\langle\!\langle M(\varphi), M(\varphi)\rangle\!\rangle_t = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \int_0^t \Big(\iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} f_s\sigma_k\cdot\nabla_v\varphi \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}v\Big)^2 \mathrm{d}s.$$
$$\langle\!\langle M(\varphi), \beta_k\rangle\!\rangle_t = \int_0^t \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} f_s\sigma_k\cdot\nabla_v\varphi \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}v\mathrm{d}s.$$

Remark 3.2. Note that if f is a martingale solution to a stochastic kinetic equation driven by g and starting from f_0 relative to the stochastic basis $(\Omega,\mathcal{F},\mathbb{P},(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t=0}^T,\{\beta_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}})$, then for all $t\in[0,T]$ the following identity holds $\mathbb{P}$ almost surely

$$\begin{aligned}\iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} f_t\varphi \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}v = \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} f_0\varphi \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}v + \int_0^t \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} [f_s(v\cdot\nabla_x + \mathcal{L}_\sigma)\varphi + g_s\varphi]\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}v\mathrm{d}s \\ + \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \int_0^t \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} f_s\sigma_k\cdot\nabla_v\varphi \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}v\mathrm{d}\beta_k(s).\end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

This is guaranteed by Lemma A.3 of the appendix.

The following existence result may be proved with a small modification to the arguments given in [23] (which use a strategy developed already in the Ph.D thesis of E. Pardoux [38]).

Theorem 3.3 (Existence)**.** *Let $\{\beta_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a given collection of $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t=0}^T$ Brownian motions. Assume that $g\in L^\infty(\Omega;L^1_{t,x,v}\cap L^\infty_{t,x,v})$, and $(\int_0^t g_s\mathrm{d}s)_{t=0}^T$ is an $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t=0}^T$ adapted process. Then there exists a weak martingale solution f (relative to the given stochastic basis) to the stochastic kinetic equation driven by g with initial data f_0. Moreover, we have the following estimate for every $p\in[1,\infty)$,*

$$\mathbb{E}\|f\|^p_{L^p_{t,x,v}} \lesssim \|f_0\|^p_{L^p_{x,v}} + \mathbb{E}\|g\|^p_{L^p_{t,x,v}}.$$

The next result is a time regularity estimate.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $q \in (2,\infty]$ and assume $f \in L^{\infty-}(\Omega; L^q_t(L^1_{x,v}))$ is a weak martingale solution to the stochastic kinetic transport equation driven by $g \in L^{\infty-}(\Omega; L^q_t(L^1_{x,v}))$ with with initial data $f_0 \in L^1_{x,v}$. Then for any test function $\varphi \in C^\infty_c(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$ and $p \in (\frac{2q}{q-2}, \infty)$, we have the following estimate*

$$\mathbb{E}\|\langle f, \varphi\rangle\|^p_{W^{\gamma,p}_t} \leq C_{\varphi,\sigma}\bigg(\mathbb{E}\|f\|^p_{L^q_t(L^1_{x,v})} + \mathbb{E}\|g\|^p_{L^q_t(L^1_{x,v})}\bigg),$$

where $\gamma = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q}$.

Proof. Consider two times $t, s \in \mathbb{R}_+$, $t \neq s$. Writing (11) in Itô form, we can conclude that the difference $\langle f_t - f_s, \varphi\rangle$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}\langle f_t - f_s, \varphi\rangle = \int_s^t \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} (v\cdot\nabla\varphi + \mathcal{L}_\sigma\varphi) f \, dx dv dr + \int_s^t \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \varphi g \, dx dv ds \\ + \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \int_s^t \bigg(\iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} f\sigma_k \cdot \nabla_v \varphi \, dx dv\bigg) d\beta_k(r).\end{aligned}$$

We would like to estimate $\mathbb{E}|\langle f_t - f_s, \varphi\rangle|^p$. To this end, since $v\cdot\nabla\varphi + \mathcal{L}_\sigma\varphi \in L^\infty_{x,v}$, we have the estimate

$$\bigg| \int_s^t \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} (v\cdot\nabla\varphi + \mathcal{L}_\sigma\varphi) f \, dx dv dr\bigg|^p \leq C_{\varphi,\sigma}|t-s|^{p(1-q)}\|f\|^p_{L^q_t(L^1_{x,v})},$$

and similarly

$$\bigg| \int_s^t \varphi g \, dx dv ds\bigg|^p \leq C_\varphi |t-s|^{p(1-q)}\|g\|^p_{L^q_t(L^1_{x,v})}.$$

By the BDG inequality we may estimate the martingale term by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\bigg|\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \int_s^t \bigg(\iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} f\sigma_k\cdot\nabla\varphi \, dx dv\bigg) d\beta_k(r)\bigg|^p &\leq \mathbb{E}\bigg(\int_s^t \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \bigg(\iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} f\sigma_k\cdot\nabla\varphi \, dx dv\bigg)^2 dr\bigg)^{p/2} \\ &\leq C_\varphi |t-s|^{\frac{p}{2}(1-\frac{2}{q})}\mathbb{E}\|f\|^p_{L^q_t(L^1_{x,v})}.\end{aligned}$$

Combining these estimates gives

$$\mathbb{E}|\langle f_t - f_s, \varphi\rangle|^p \leq C_{\varphi,\sigma}|t-s|^{p(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{q})}\bigg(|t-s|^{\frac{p}{2}}\mathbb{E}\|f\|^p_{L^q_t(L^1_{x,v})} + |t-s|^{\frac{p}{2}}\mathbb{E}\|g\|^p_{L^q_t(L^1_{x,v})} + \mathbb{E}\|f\|^p_{L^q_t(L^1_{x,v})}\bigg).$$

We now estimate the regularity of $\langle f, \varphi\rangle$ via the Sobolev-Slobodeckij semi-norm $[\cdot]_{W^{\gamma,p}_t}$. For $\gamma p + 1 = p(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{q})$ we find

$$\mathbb{E}[\langle f, \varphi\rangle]^p_{W^{\gamma,p}_t} = \int_0^T \int_0^T \frac{\mathbb{E}|\langle f_t - f_s, \varphi\rangle|^p}{|t-s|^{\gamma p+1}} ds dt \leq C_{\varphi,\sigma}\bigg(\mathbb{E}\|f\|^p_{L^\infty_t(L^1_{x,v})} + \|g\|^p_{L^\infty_t(L^1_{x,v})}\bigg).$$

□

3.2 Stability of weak martingale solutions

In this section, we establish our main stability result for sequences of weak martingale solutions to stochastic kinetic equations. The result below will be used repeatedly throughout the article.

Proposition 3.5. *Let $f : \Omega \times [0,T] \to L^1_{x,v}$ be a stochastic process and $\{\beta_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a collection of Brownian motions. Assume there exists a sequence of processes $\{f_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ with the following properties.*

1. *For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exist g_n, f_n^0, and σ_n such that f_n is a weak martingale solution to a stochastic kinetic equation driven by g_n with initial data f_n^0, relative to the noise coefficients $\sigma^n = \{\sigma_k^n\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ and the stochastic basis $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, (\mathcal{F}_t^n)_{t=0}^T, \{\beta_k^n\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}})$.*

2. *The sequences $\{f_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $\{g_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ are bounded in $L^2(\Omega; L_t^\infty(L^1_{x,v}))$ and $L^2(\Omega; L^1_{t,x,v})$ respectively. Moreover, for each $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$,*

$$\langle f_n, \varphi\rangle \to \langle f, \varphi\rangle \quad \text{in} \quad L^2(\Omega; C_t), \tag{26}$$

and for each $t \in [0,T]$,

$$\left\langle \int_0^t g_n(s)ds, \varphi \right\rangle \to \left\langle \int_0^t g(s)ds, \varphi \right\rangle \quad \text{in} \quad L^2(\Omega). \tag{27}$$

3. *As $n \to \infty$, the following convergences hold:*

$$\begin{aligned} \{\beta_k^n\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}} &\to \{\beta_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \quad \text{in} \quad L^2(\Omega; [C_t]^\infty). \\ f_n^0 &\to f^0 \quad \text{in} \quad L^1_{x,v}. \\ \sigma^n &\to \sigma \quad \text{in} \quad \ell^2(\mathbb{N}; L^\infty_{x,v}). \\ \sigma^n \cdot \nabla_v \sigma^n &\to \sigma \cdot \nabla_v \sigma \quad \text{in} \quad \ell^1(\mathbb{N}; L^\infty_{x,v}). \end{aligned}$$

Under these hypotheses, we may deduce that f is a weak martingale solution driven by g and starting from f_0, relative to the noise coefficients σ and the Brownian motions $\{\beta_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$.

Moreover, if $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, (\mathcal{F}_t^n)_{t=0}^T, \{\beta_k^n\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}})$ is independent of $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then f can be built with respect to the same stochastic basis.

Proof. Define a collection of topological spaces $(E_t)_{t=0}^T$ by $E_t = C\Big([0,t]; [L^1_{x,v}]^2_w\Big) \times C[0,t]^\infty$. Let $r_t : E_T \to E_t$ be the corresponding restriction operators. Next define the $L^1_{x,v}$ valued processes $(G_t)_{t=0}^T$ and $(G_t^n)_{t=0}^T$ to be the running time integrals (starting from 0) of g and g_n, respectively. Use these to define the E_T valued random variables $X = (f, G, \{\beta_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}})$ and $X_n = (f_n, G_n, \{\beta_k^n\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}})$.

We will verify that f is a weak martingale solution relative to the filtration $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t=0}^T$ given by $\mathcal{F}_t = \sigma(r_t X)$. With this filtration, Part 1 of Definition 3.1 certainly holds. Part 2 is true by assumption. Hence, if suffices to verify Part 3. Let $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$ and define the continuous process $(M_t(\varphi))_{t=0}^T$ by (24). Let $s < t$ be two times and suppose that $\gamma \in C_b(E_s;\mathbb{R})$. It suffices to show

$$\mathbb{E}\Big(\gamma(r_s X)\Big(M_t(\varphi) - M_s(\varphi)\Big)\Big) = 0 \tag{28}$$

$$\mathbb{E}\Big(\gamma(r_s X)\Big(M_t(\varphi)^2 - M_s(\varphi)^2\Big)\Big) = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E}\bigg(\gamma(r_s X)\int_s^t \bigg(\iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} f\sigma_k \cdot \nabla_v \varphi \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}v\bigg)^2 \mathrm{d}r\bigg) \tag{29}$$

$$\mathbb{E}\Big(\gamma(r_s X)\Big(M_t(\varphi)\beta_k(t) - M_s(\varphi)\beta_k(s)\Big)\Big) = \mathbb{E}\bigg(\gamma(r_s X)\int_s^t \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \sigma_k \cdot \nabla_v \varphi f \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}v\mathrm{d}r\bigg). \tag{30}$$

Begin by defining the filtration $(\mathcal{F}_t^n)_{t=0}^T$ by the relation $\mathcal{F}_t^n = \sigma(r_t X_n)$. Let the $(\mathcal{F}_t^n)_{t=0}^T$ continuous martingale $(M_t^n(\varphi))_{t=0}^T$ defined by (24), with f_n, f_n^0, and σ^n replacing f, f^0, and σ. By the first assumption of the Proposition and Definition 3.1, we find that

$$\mathbb{E}\Big(\gamma(r_t X_n)\Big(M_t^n(\varphi) - M_s^n(\varphi)\Big)\Big) = 0$$

Passing to a subsequence if necessary, the second and third assumptions of the Proposition imply that for each $t \in [0,T]$, the random variables $\{M_t^n(\varphi)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converge to $M_t(\varphi)$ in $L^2(\Omega)$. Indeed, this hinges on the following facts. First, the sequences $\{\langle f_n(t), \varphi\rangle\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $\{\langle G_n(t), \varphi\rangle\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converge to $\langle f(t), \varphi\rangle$ and $\langle G(t), \varphi\rangle$ in $L^2(\Omega)$. Second, the sequence $\{\mathcal{L}_{\sigma^n}\varphi\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges to $\mathcal{L}_\sigma\varphi$ in $L^\infty_{x,v}$. A similar argument shows that for each $t \in [0,T]$, the random variables $\{\gamma(r_t X_n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converge to $\gamma(r_t X)$ in $L^{\infty-}(\Omega)$. To treat the sequence $\{G^n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, we use the fact that if a sequence of continuous functions converges pointwise to a continuous limit, then the convergence is also uniform. With these remarks, we may pass $n \to \infty$ and deduce (28). Next we observe that:

$$\mathbb{E}\Big(\gamma(r_s X_n)\Big(M_t^n(\varphi)^2 - M_s^n(\varphi)^2\Big)\Big) = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E}\bigg(\gamma(r_s X_n)\int_s^t \bigg(\iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} f_n\sigma_k^n \cdot \nabla_v \varphi \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}v\bigg)^2 \mathrm{d}r\bigg). \tag{31}$$

Using the facts mentioned above, we deduce that for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}\bigg(\gamma(r_s X_n)\int_s^t \bigg(\iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} f_n\sigma_k^n \cdot \nabla_v \varphi \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}v\bigg)^2 \mathrm{d}r\bigg) = \mathbb{E}\bigg(\gamma(r_s X)\int_s^t \bigg(\iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} f\sigma_k \cdot \nabla_v \varphi \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}v\bigg)^2 \mathrm{d}r\bigg).$$

Moreover, we have the inequality

$$\mathbb{E}\bigg(\gamma(r_s X_n)\int_s^t \bigg(\iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} f_n\sigma_k^n \cdot \nabla_v \varphi \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}v\bigg)^2 \mathrm{d}r\bigg) \leq |\gamma|_{C_b(E_s;\mathbb{R})} |\nabla_v\varphi|_{L^\infty_{x,v}} \mathbb{E}\|f_n\|^2_{L^2_t(L^1_{x,v})} \|\sigma_k^n\|^2_{L^\infty_{x,v}}.$$

Since $\{\sigma^n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is strongly compact in $\ell^2(\mathbb{N};L^\infty_{x,v})$, it follows that

$$\lim_{N\to\infty}\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\sum_{k=N}^{\infty}\|\sigma_k^n\|^2_{L^\infty_{x,v}}=0.$$

Since $\{f_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded in $L^2(\Omega;L^2_t(L^1_{x,v}))$, by splitting the series into finitely many terms plus a uniformly controlled remainder, we find that:

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{n\to\infty}\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}}\mathbb{E}\bigg(\gamma(r_sX_n)\int_s^t\Big(\iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}}f_n\sigma_k^n\cdot\nabla_v\varphi\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}v\Big)^2\mathrm{d}r\bigg)\\ =\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}}\mathbb{E}\bigg(\gamma(r_sX)\int_s^t\Big(\iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}}f\sigma_k\cdot\nabla_v\varphi\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}v\Big)^2\mathrm{d}r\bigg).\end{aligned}$$

We may now pass $n\to\infty$ on both sides of (31) to obtain (29). An entirely similar argument yields (30). This completes the proof. □

3.3 Renormalization

Formally, given a regular solution f to (23) and a smooth $\Gamma:\mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R}$, Ito's formula implies that $\Gamma(f)$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}&\partial_t\Gamma(f)+v\cdot\nabla_x\Gamma(f)+\mathrm{div}_v(\Gamma(f)\sigma_k\circ\dot\beta_k)=\Gamma'(f)g,\\&\Gamma(f)|_{t=0}=\Gamma(f_0).\end{aligned}\tag{32}$$

However, if we only impose Hypothesis 1.2 on the noise coefficients, it is not clear whether (32) can be justified when f is only a weak martingale solution to (23). In this section, we show that if f has increased local integrability in x,v and σ has sufficient Sobolev regularity, then (32) holds relative to a large class of renormalizations Γ. Towards this end, we introduce the notion of renormalized martingale solution to (23).

Definition 3.6 (Renormalized Martingale Solution)**.** Suppose that $(f_t)_{t=0}^T$ is a weak martingale solution to the stochastic kinetic equation driven by g with initial data f_0. We say that $(f_t)_{t=0}^T$ is a renormalized weak martingale solution provided that for all renormalizations $\Gamma\in C^2(\mathbb{R})$ with $\sup_{z\in\mathbb{R}}(|\Gamma'(z)|+|\Gamma''(z)|)<\infty$ and $\Gamma(0)=0$, the process $(\Gamma(f)_t)_{t=0}^T$ is weak martingale solution to the stochastic kinetic equation driven by $\Gamma'(f)g$ with initial data $\Gamma(f_0)$.

Remark 3.7. It is important to note the assumptions on Γ ensure that a renormalized martingale solution is consistent with our definition of weak martingale solution given in 3.1. Specifically, the assumptions $\sup_{z\in\mathbb{R}}|\Gamma'(z)|<\infty$ and $\Gamma(0)=0$ given in definition 3.6 imply that $\Gamma(z)\le C|z|$. This means that when $f\in L^2(\Omega;L^\infty_t(L^1_{x,v}))$, so is $\Gamma(f)$. Likewise we see that $\Gamma(f_0)\in L^1_{x,v}$ when f_0 is and $\Gamma'(f)g\in L^1(\Omega;L^1_{t,x,v})$ when g is.

Proposition 3.8. *Let f be a weak martingale solution to the stochastic kinetic equation driven by g with initial data f_0. Assume that $f \in L^p(\Omega \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^{2d})$ for some $p \in [2,\infty)$. If the noise coefficients satisfy $\sigma \in \ell^2(\mathbb{N}; W^{1,\frac{2p}{p-2}}_{x,v})$ and $\sigma \cdot \nabla_v \sigma \in \ell^1(\mathbb{N}; W^{1,\frac{p}{p-1}}_{x,v})$, then f is also a renormalized weak martingale solution.*

Proof. Let Γ satisfy the assumptions of definition 3.6 , then our goal is to establish that $\Gamma(f)$ is a weak martingale solution driven by $\Gamma'(f)g$ starting from $\Gamma(f_0)$. Towards this end, let η be a standard symmetric mollifier with support contained in the unit ball on $\mathbb{R}^d_x \times \mathbb{R}^d_v$ with $\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \eta(x,v)\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}v = 1$. Set $\eta_\varepsilon(x,v) = \varepsilon^{-2d}\eta(\varepsilon^{-1}x, \varepsilon^{-1}v)$ and denote by $f_{t,\varepsilon} = \eta_\varepsilon * f_t = (f_t)_\varepsilon$ the mollified process.

Let $\varphi \in C^\infty_c(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$. The main step in this proof will be to establish that for all $t \in [0,T]$, the following identity holds $\mathbb{P}$ almost surely:

$$\begin{aligned}\iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \Gamma(f_{t,\varepsilon})\varphi \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}v = &\iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \Gamma(f_{0,\varepsilon})\varphi \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}v \\ &+ \int_0^t \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} [\Gamma(f_{s,\varepsilon})(v\cdot\nabla_x + \mathcal{L}_\sigma)\varphi + \varphi\Gamma'(f_{s,\varepsilon})g_{s,\varepsilon}]\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}v\mathrm{d}s \\ &+ \sum_{k=1}^\infty \int_0^t \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \Gamma(f_{s,\varepsilon})\sigma_k \cdot \nabla_v \varphi \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}v\mathrm{d}\beta_k(s) + R^\varphi_\varepsilon(t),\end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

for a process $(R^\varphi_\varepsilon(t))_{t=0}^T$ such that for each $t \in [0,T]$,

$$R^\varphi_\varepsilon(t) \to 0 \quad \text{in probability as} \quad \varepsilon \to 0. \tag{34}$$

Assuming we can verify (33) and (34), let us complete the proof. Using standard properties of mollifiers it is straight forward to verify that for every $t \in [0,T]$ and $\mathbb{P}$ almost every $\omega \in \Omega$,

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma(f_{t,\varepsilon}) \to \Gamma(f_t) \quad &\text{in} \quad L^1_{x,v} \\ \Gamma(f_{0,\varepsilon}) \to \Gamma(f_0) \quad &\text{in} \quad L^1_{x,v},\end{aligned}$$

and furthermore that

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma(f_\varepsilon) \to \Gamma(f) \quad &\text{in} \quad L^2(\Omega; L^2_t(L^1_{x,v})), \\ \Gamma'(f_\varepsilon)g_\varepsilon \to \Gamma'(f)g \quad &\text{in} \quad L^1(\Omega; L^1_{t,x,v}).\end{aligned}$$

Using the convergence properties above along with the Itô isometry and the convergence of R^φ_ε to 0, we may pass the $\varepsilon \to 0$ limit in each term of (33), where the convergence holds in probability for each $t \in [0,T]$. We conclude that $\Gamma(f)$ solves

$$\begin{aligned}\iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \Gamma(f_t)\varphi \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}v = &\iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \Gamma(f_0)\varphi \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}v + \int_0^t \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} [\Gamma(f_s)(v\cdot\nabla_x + \mathcal{L}_\sigma)\varphi + \varphi\Gamma'(f_s)g_s]\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}v\mathrm{d}s \\ &+ \sum_{k=1}^\infty \int_0^t \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \Gamma(f_s)\sigma_k \cdot \nabla_v \varphi \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}v\mathrm{d}\beta_k(s),\end{aligned}$$

thereby completing the proof.

It now remains to verify identity (33) along with the vanishing of the remainder (34). We begin by considering the equation (25). We fix $z = (x,v) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ and choose $\varphi(w) = \eta_\varepsilon(z-w)$. This is equilvalent to mollifying both sides of equation, giving

$$f_{t,\varepsilon}(z) = f_{0,\varepsilon}(z) + \int_0^t [(-v\cdot\nabla_x f_s)_\varepsilon(z) + (\mathcal{L}_\sigma f)_\varepsilon(z) + g_{s,\varepsilon}(z)]\mathrm{d}s - \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \int_0^t (\sigma_k\cdot\nabla_v f_s)_\varepsilon(z)\mathrm{d}\beta_k(s).$$

For each $z \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$, we may renormalize by Γ by applying Itô's formula,

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma(f_{t,\varepsilon}(z)) = \Gamma(f_{0,\varepsilon}(z)) &+ \int_0^t \Gamma'(f_{s,\varepsilon}(z))[(-v\cdot\nabla_x f_s)_\varepsilon(z) + (\mathcal{L}_\sigma f)_\varepsilon(z) + g_{s,\varepsilon}(z)]\mathrm{d}s \\ &+ \frac{1}{2}\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \int_0^t \Gamma''(f_{s,\varepsilon}(z))(\sigma_k\cdot\nabla_v f_s)^2_\varepsilon(z)\mathrm{d}s - \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \int_0^t \Gamma'(f_{s,\varepsilon}(z))(\sigma_k\cdot\nabla_v f_s)_\varepsilon(z)\mathrm{d}\beta_k(s).\end{aligned}$$

Naturally we can force the form of (33) into view by the use of the commutators,

$$\begin{aligned}[\eta_\varepsilon, v\cdot\nabla_x](f) &= (v\cdot\nabla_x f)_\varepsilon - v\cdot\nabla_x f_\varepsilon \\ [\eta_\varepsilon, \mathcal{L}_\sigma](f) &= (\mathcal{L}_\sigma f)_\varepsilon - \mathcal{L}_\sigma f_\varepsilon \\ [\eta_\varepsilon, \sigma_k\cdot\nabla_v](f) &= (\sigma_k\cdot\nabla_v f)_\varepsilon - \sigma_k\cdot\nabla_v f_\varepsilon.\end{aligned}$$

Specifically, using the fact that $\mathcal{L}_\sigma\Gamma(f) = \Gamma'(f)\mathcal{L}_\sigma f + \frac{1}{2}(\sigma_k\cdot\nabla_v f)^2\Gamma''(f)$, we find

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma(f_{t,\varepsilon}) = \Gamma(f_{0,\varepsilon}) &+ \int_0^t [(-v\cdot\nabla + \mathcal{L}_\sigma)\Gamma(f_{s,\varepsilon}) + \Gamma'(f_{s,\varepsilon})g_{s,\varepsilon}]\mathrm{d}s \\ &- \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \int_0^t \sigma_k\cdot\nabla_v\Gamma(f_{s,\varepsilon})\mathrm{d}\beta_k(s) + R_{t,\varepsilon}\end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

where $R_{t,\varepsilon}$ is a given by

$$\begin{aligned}R_{t,\varepsilon} = \int_0^t \Gamma'(f_{s,\varepsilon})\Big(&-[\eta_\varepsilon, v\cdot\nabla_x](f_s) + [\eta_\varepsilon, \mathcal{L}_\sigma](f_s)\Big)\mathrm{d}s \\ &+ \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t \Gamma''(f_{s,\varepsilon})[(\sigma_k\cdot\nabla_v f_s)^2_\varepsilon - (\sigma_k\cdot\nabla_v f_{s,\varepsilon})^2]\mathrm{d}s \\ &- \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \int_0^t \Gamma'(f_{s,\varepsilon})[\eta_\varepsilon, \sigma_k\cdot\nabla_v](f_s)\mathrm{d}\beta_k(s).\end{aligned}$$

Integrating both sides of (35) against φ, we obtain (33).

It remains to show that for each $t \in [0,T]$,

$$R^\varphi_\varepsilon(t) := \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \varphi R_{t,\varepsilon}\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}v \to 0 \quad \text{in probability as} \quad \varepsilon \to 0.$$

This will be proved with the aid of standard commutator lemmas taken from [18]. Specifically, we use that $f \in L^p(\Omega \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^{2d}) \cap L^p(\Omega \times [0,T]; L^1_{x,v})$ and for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $\sigma_k \in W^{1,\frac{2p}{p-2}}_{x,v}$. It follows that for almost every $(\omega,t) \in \Omega \times [0,T]$ we have

$$[\eta_\varepsilon, v \cdot \nabla_x](f_t) \to 0 \quad \text{in} \quad [L^2_{x,v}]_{\text{loc}}, \tag{36}$$

$$[\eta_\varepsilon, \sigma_k \cdot \nabla_v](f_t) \to 0 \quad \text{in} \quad [L^2_{x,v}]_{\text{loc}}, \tag{37}$$

as well as the bound,

$$\|[\eta_\varepsilon, \sigma_k \cdot \nabla_v](f_t)\|_{L^2_{x,v}} \leq \|\sigma_k\|_{W^{1,\frac{2p}{p-2}}_{x,v}} \|f_t\|_{L^p_{x,v}}. \tag{38}$$

In order to use the commutator results (36) and (37) to our advantage, we will need to manipulate $R_{t,\varepsilon}$. First we write the commutator $[\eta_\varepsilon, \mathcal{L}_\sigma](f)$ in terms of $[\eta_\varepsilon, \sigma_k \cdot \nabla_v]$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
[\eta_\varepsilon, \mathcal{L}_\sigma](f) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \Big((\sigma_k \cdot \nabla_v (\sigma_k \cdot \nabla_v f))_\varepsilon - \sigma_k \cdot \nabla_v (\sigma_k \cdot \nabla_v f_\varepsilon) \Big) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \Big([\eta_\varepsilon, \sigma_k \cdot \nabla_v](\sigma_k \cdot \nabla_v f) + \sigma_k \cdot \nabla_v [\eta_\varepsilon, \sigma_k \cdot \nabla_v](f) \Big).
\end{aligned}$$

The second observation is the following equalities

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2}\Gamma''(f_\varepsilon)[(\sigma_k \cdot \nabla_v f)^2_\varepsilon - (\sigma_k \cdot \nabla_v f_\varepsilon)^2] \\
&\quad = \frac{1}{2}\Gamma''(f_\varepsilon)[\eta_\varepsilon, \sigma_k \cdot \nabla_v](f)\Big((\sigma_k \cdot \nabla_v f)_\varepsilon + \sigma_k \cdot \nabla_v f_\varepsilon \Big) \\
&\quad = \frac{1}{2}\Gamma''(f_\varepsilon)\Big([\eta_\varepsilon, \sigma_k \cdot \nabla_v](f) \Big)^2 + \Gamma''(f_\varepsilon)[\eta_\varepsilon, \sigma_k \cdot \nabla_v](f) \sigma_k \cdot \nabla_v f_\varepsilon \\
&\quad = \frac{1}{2}\Gamma''(f_\varepsilon)\Big([\eta_\varepsilon, \sigma_k \cdot \nabla_v](f) \Big)^2 - \Gamma'(f_\varepsilon) \sigma_k \cdot \nabla [\eta_\varepsilon, \sigma_k \cdot \nabla_v](f) + \sigma_k \cdot \nabla_v \Big(\Gamma'(f_\varepsilon)[\eta_\varepsilon, \sigma_k \cdot \nabla_v](f) \Big).
\end{aligned}$$

Adding the two identities above and introducing the double commutator $\Big[[\eta_\varepsilon, \sigma_k \cdot \nabla_v], \sigma_k \cdot \nabla_v\Big]$ defined by

$$\Big[[\eta_\varepsilon, \sigma_k \cdot \nabla_v], \sigma_k \cdot \nabla_v\Big](f) = [\eta_\varepsilon, \sigma_k \cdot \nabla_v](\sigma_k \cdot \nabla_v f) - \sigma_k \cdot \nabla_v [\eta_\varepsilon, \sigma_k \cdot \nabla_v](f),$$

we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Gamma'(f_\varepsilon)[\eta_\varepsilon, \mathcal{L}_\sigma](f) + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{2}\Gamma''(f_\varepsilon)[(\sigma_k \cdot \nabla_v f)^2_\varepsilon - (\sigma_k \cdot \nabla_v f_\varepsilon)^2] \\
&\qquad = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \Big(\sigma_k \cdot \nabla_v \Big(\Gamma'(f_\varepsilon)[\eta_\varepsilon, \sigma_k \cdot \nabla_v](f) \Big) + \frac{1}{2}\Gamma''(f_\varepsilon)\Big([\eta_\varepsilon, \sigma_k \cdot \nabla_v](f) \Big)^2 \\
&\qquad\qquad + \frac{1}{2}\Gamma'(f_\varepsilon)\Big[[\eta_\varepsilon, \sigma_k \cdot \nabla_v], \sigma_k \cdot \nabla_v\Big](f) \Big).
\end{aligned}$$

The process $R_{t,\varepsilon}$ is therefore given by

$$\begin{aligned}R_{t,\varepsilon} = &-\int_0^t \Gamma'(f_{s,\varepsilon})[\eta_\varepsilon, v\cdot\nabla_x](f_s)\mathrm{d}s + \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}}\int_0^t \sigma_k\cdot\nabla_v\Big(\Gamma'(f_\varepsilon)[\eta_\varepsilon,\sigma_k\cdot\nabla_v](f_s)\Big)\,\mathrm{d}s\\ &+\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}}\int_0^t\Big(\frac{1}{2}\Gamma''(f_{s,\varepsilon})\Big([\eta_\varepsilon,\sigma_k\cdot\nabla_v](f_s)\Big)^2+\frac{1}{2}\Gamma'(f_{s,\varepsilon})\Big[[\eta_\varepsilon,\sigma_k\cdot\nabla_v],\sigma_k\cdot\nabla_v\Big](f_s)\Big)\mathrm{d}s\\ &+\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}}\int_0^t\Gamma'(f_{s,\varepsilon})[\eta_\varepsilon,\sigma_k\cdot\nabla_v](f_s)\mathrm{d}\beta_k(s).\end{aligned}$$

Integrating $R_{t,\varepsilon}$ against φ to obtain $R^\varphi_\varepsilon(t)$, it is now possible to use the convergences (36), (37), the uniform bound (38), and our assumptions on the noise coefficients to show that each term in $R^\varphi_\varepsilon(t)$ involving the single commutators, $[\eta_\varepsilon, v\cdot\nabla_x](f)$ and $[\eta_\varepsilon,\sigma_k\cdot\nabla_v](f)$, converges to 0 in probability for each $t\in[0,T]$.

It remains to estimate the double commutator term

$$I_{t,\varepsilon}=\frac{1}{2}\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}}\int_0^t\iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}}\varphi\Gamma'(f_{s,\varepsilon})\Big[[\eta_\varepsilon,\sigma_k\cdot\nabla_v],\sigma_k\cdot\nabla_v\Big](f_s)\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}v\mathrm{d}s.$$

We will prove that for each $t\in[0,T]$, $I_{t,\varepsilon}\to 0$ in probability.

In what follows, to simplify notation, we will denote both $z=(x,v)$ and $w=(y,u)$ the phase space (position-velocity) coordinates in $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$ wherever possible, and define the translation operator

$$\delta_w f(z) := f(z+w)-f(z).$$

We will need to evaluate the double-commutator explicitly. This will be done piece by piece. For the first piece, since $\mathrm{div}_v\,\sigma_k=0$, integrating by parts gives

$$\begin{aligned}[\eta_\varepsilon\,,\,\sigma_k\cdot\nabla_v]\,(\sigma_k\cdot\nabla_v f_t)(z) = &\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}}\nabla_v^2\eta_\varepsilon(z-w):\sigma_k(w)\otimes[\sigma_k(w)-\sigma_k(z)]\,f_t(w)\,\mathrm{d}w\\ &-\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}}\nabla_v\eta_\varepsilon(z-w)\cdot(\sigma_k(w)\cdot\nabla_v\sigma_k(w))\,f_t(w)\,\mathrm{d}w,\end{aligned}$$

and similarly, for the second piece, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_k\cdot\nabla_v\,[\eta_\varepsilon\,,\,\sigma_k\cdot\nabla_v]\,(f_t)(z) = &\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}}\nabla_v^2\eta_\varepsilon(z-w):[\sigma_k(w)-\sigma_k(z)]\otimes\sigma_k(z)\,f_t(w)\,\mathrm{d}w\\ &-\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}}\nabla_v\eta_\varepsilon(z-w)\cdot(\sigma_k(z)\cdot\nabla_v\sigma_k(z))\,f_t(w)\,\mathrm{d}w.\end{aligned}$$

Note that the operation $f\to\Big[[\eta_\varepsilon,\sigma_k\cdot\nabla_v],\sigma_k\cdot\nabla_v\Big](f)$ vanishes on constant functions. Hence, in both identities above we may freely replace $f(w)$ by $f(w)-f(z)$. Therefore, using the symmetry of

$\nabla_v^2 \eta_\varepsilon$, and changing variables $w \to w+z$, we conclude that the double commutator can be written in the following form

$$\Big[[\eta_\varepsilon, \sigma_k \cdot \nabla_v], \sigma_k \cdot \nabla_v\Big](f_t)(z) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \nabla_v^2 \eta_\varepsilon(w) : (\delta_w \sigma_k(z) \otimes \delta_w \sigma_k(z)) \delta_w f_t(z)\, \mathrm{d}w$$
$$+ \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \nabla_v \eta_\varepsilon(w) \cdot \delta_w(\sigma_k \cdot \nabla_v \sigma_k)(z) \delta_w f_t(z)\, \mathrm{d}w.$$

Next we use the fact that for any $g \in W^{1;r}_{x,v}$, the following inequality holds pointwise in $w \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$

$$|\delta_w g|_{L^r_{x,v}} \leq |w| |\nabla g|_{L^r_{x,v}}. \tag{39}$$

Using Holder's inequality, the estimate (39), and the fact that $|\nabla_v^2 \eta_\varepsilon(w)|\,|w|^2$ and $|\nabla_v \eta_\varepsilon(w)|\,|w|$ are uniformly bounded in L^1_w, we may estimate $I_{t,\varepsilon}$ for each $t \in [0,T]$ and $\omega \in \Omega$,

$$|I_{t,\varepsilon}| \leq C_\varphi \Big(\|\sigma\|^2_{\ell^2(\mathbb{N}; W^{1,\frac{2p}{p-2}}_{x,v})} + \|\sigma \cdot \nabla \sigma\|_{\ell^1(\mathbb{N}; W^{1,\frac{p}{p-1}}_{x,v})} \Big) \|\Gamma'(f_\varepsilon)\|_{L^\infty_{t,x,v}} \sup_{|w|<\varepsilon} \|\delta_w f\|_{L^p_{t,x,v}}.$$

Since $f \in L^p([0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^{2d})$ with probability one,

$$\sup_{|w|<\varepsilon} \|\delta_w f\|_{L^p_{t,x,v}} \to 0, \quad \mathbb{P} \text{ almost surely.}$$

The proof of the Proposition is now complete since this implies $I_{t,\varepsilon} \to 0$ in probability for each $t \in [0,T]$.

□

This section is now completed by checking that renormalized, weak martingale solutions to (23) with additional integrability have strongly continuous sample paths. The following lemma will be crucial for ultimately deducing strong continuity properties of the solution to the stochastic Boltzmann equation.

Lemma 3.9 (Strong Continuity)**.** *Let f be a renormalized weak martingale solution to the stochastic kinetic equation driven by g with initial data f_0. If f belongs to $L^\infty_t(L^p_{x,v})$ with probability one for some $p \in (1,\infty)$, then $f \in C_t(L^q_{x,v})$ with probability one for any $q \in (1,p)$.*

Proof. We begin by remarking that $f \in C_t([L^p_{x,v}]_w)$ with probability one. Indeed, let $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$. It follows directly from inspection of the weak form and elementary properties of stochastic integrals that the process $t \to \langle f_t, \varphi \rangle$ has continuous sample paths. Moreover, since f belongs to $L^\infty_t(L^p_{x,v})$ with probability one, it follows that $f \in C_t([L^p_{x,v}]_w)$ with probability one.

The next step is to upgrade to continuity with values in $L^q_{x,v}$ with the strong topology. Towards this end, let $\psi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be defined by $\psi(x) = |x|^q$. We may choose a sequence of smooth, truncations of ψ, denoted $\{\psi_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ that satisfy the conditions on the renormalizations in Definition 3.6

such that ψ_k converge pointwise in $\mathbb{R}$ to ψ as $k \to \infty$. Moreover, these truncations can be chosen so that when $|x| < k$, $\psi_k(x) = \psi(x)$, and when $|x| > k$, $0 \leq \psi_k(x) \leq \psi(x)$. Applying Proposition 3.8, and using the fact that, with probability one, $\psi_k(f)$ is in $L^\infty_t(L^1_{x,v})$ and $\psi_k'(f)g$ is in $L^1_{t,x,v}$, we find that, for all $t \in [0,T]$, we have the $\mathbb{P}$- a.s. identity,

$$\|\psi_k(f_t)\|_{L^1_{x,v}} = \|\psi_k(f_0)\|_{L^1_{x,v}} + \int_0^t \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \psi_k'(f_s) g_s \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}v\mathrm{d}s.$$

In particular, this implies that $t \mapsto \|\psi_k(f_t)\|_{L^1_{x,v}}$ has continuous sample paths with probability one. Since weak martingale solutions are in $C_t([L^1_{x,v}]_w)$ with probability one, then by interpolation, f is in $C_t([L^q_{x,v}]_w)$ with probability one, and therefore for each $t \in [0,T]$, $\|\psi(f_t)\|_{L^1_{x,v}}$ is defined $\mathbb{P}$- a.s.

Next, we claim that, $\mathbb{P}$ almost surely,

$$\|\psi_k(f)\|_{L^1_{x,v}} \to \|\psi(f)\|_{L^1_{x,v}} \quad \text{in} \quad L^\infty([0,T]),$$

whereby we may conclude that $t \to \|f_t\|_{L^q_{x,v}}$ has continuous sample paths with probability one. Indeed, we find

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{t\in[0,T]} \left| \|\psi(f)\|_{L^1_{x,v}} - \|\psi_k(f)\|_{L^1_{x,v}} \right| &\leq \|\psi(f) - \psi_k(f)\|_{L^\infty_t(L^1_{x,v})} \leq \|\psi(f)\mathbb{1}_{f\geq k}\|_{L^\infty_t(L^1_{x,v})} \\
&\leq \|f\|^q_{L^\infty_t(L^p_{x,v})} \Big(\sup_{t\in[0,T]} |\{|f_t| \geq k\}| \Big)^{1-p/q} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{k^{p-q}} \|f\|^p_{L^\infty_t(L^p_{x,v})} \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad k \to \infty.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $L^q_{x,v}$ is a uniformly convex space for $q > 1$, the fact that f is in $C_t([L^q_{x,v}]_w)$ with probability one, combined with the fact $t \mapsto \|f_t\|_{L^q_{x,v}}$ has $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. continuous sample paths implies that $f \in C_t(L^q_{x,v})$ with probability one. □

4 Stochastic Velocity Averaging

In Section 5, we will construct a sequence $\{f_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of approximations to the Boltzmann equation (SB) with stochastic transport. These will satisfy the formal á priori bounds (6), uniformly in $n \in \mathbb{N}$ enabling us to extract a weak limit f, which will be a candidate renormalized solution to (SB). However, we need a form of strong compactness to handle the stability of the non-linear collision operator. In this section we investigate some subtle regularizing effects for stochastic kinetic equations, inspired by the classical work of Golse/Lions/Perthame/Sentis [27]. These will be applied in Section 6 to obtain a form of strong compactness of $\{f_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$. In fact, we allow for a

nontrivial probability of oscillations in the velocity variable, so the strong compactness is only in space and time.

To be more precise, we introduce a topological vector space $L^p_{t,x}(\mathcal{M}^*_v)$ as follows. Let $\mathcal{M}_v$ denote the space of locally finite Radon measures on $\mathbb{R}^d_v$, which can be identified with the dual of the continuous, compactly supported functions $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Start by partitioning the collection of measurable maps $f : [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d_x \to \mathcal{M}_v$ into equivalence classes modulo Lebesgue null sets. Such an equivalence class f is in $L^p_{t,x}(\mathcal{M}_v)$ provided that for all $\phi \in C_c(\mathbb{R}^d)$,

$$\int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\langle f(x,t), \phi \rangle|^p \, \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}s < \infty.$$

For each $\phi \in C_c(\mathbb{R}^d)$, we may define a corresponding semi-norm ν_ϕ via

$$\nu_\phi(f) = \|\langle f, \phi \rangle\|_{L^p_{t,x}}.$$

The space $L^p_{t,x}(\mathcal{M}^*_v)$ is defined to be $L^p_{t,x}(\mathcal{M}_v)$ endowed with the topology induced by this collection of semi-norms, where $\mathcal{M}^*_v$ is short-hand for $\mathcal{M}_v$ endowed with the weak-$*$ topology.

It turns out that the criteria for renormalization obtained in Section 3 plays an important role in the proof of our stochastic velocity averaging results. As a consequence, we are only able to establish our compactness criterion for sequences of well-prepared approximations. In fact, we will focus on solution sequences $\{f_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ satisfying the following:

Hypothesis 4.1. *For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, f_n is a weak martingale solution to the stochastic kinetic equation driven by g_n and starting from f_n^0, relative to the noise coefficients $\sigma^n = \{\sigma_k^n\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$. Both f_n and g_n belong to $L^{\infty-}(\Omega; L^1_{t,x,v} \cap L^\infty_{t,x,v})$, while f_n^0 is in $L^1_{x,v} \cap L^\infty_{x,v}$ and σ^n satisfies Hypothesis 1.6.*

Moreover, $\{f_n^0\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly integrable $L^1_{x,v}$ and $\{\sigma^n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ satisfies Hypothesis 1.2 uniformly.

Our main stochastic velocity averaging result can now be stated as follows:

Lemma 4.2. *Let $\{f_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence satisfying Hypothesis 4.1 such that*

$$\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E}\|(1+|x|^2+|v|^2) f_n\|_{L^1_{x,v}} < \infty. \tag{40}$$

If $\{g_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded $L^1(\Omega \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^{2d})$ and induces a tight family of laws on $[L^1_{t,x,v}]_{w,loc}$, then $\{f_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ induces a tight family of laws on $L^1_{t,x}(\mathcal{M}^*_v)$.

4.1 L^2 Velocity Averaging

As is typical with velocity averaging lemmas in L^1 (see [27]), we will find it useful first to prove an L^2 result. Roughly speaking, the L^1 case is then reduced to showing that the part of the solution sequence violating the hypotheses of the L^2 lemma has a high probability of being small in L^1.

Lemma 4.3. *Let $\{f_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence satisfying Hypothesis 4.1. If $\{f_n^0\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is bounded in $L^2_{x,v}$ while $\{g_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $\{f_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ are bounded in $L^p(\Omega\times[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^{2d})$ for each $p\geq 1$, then $\{f_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ induces a tight family of laws on $[L^2_{t,x}(\mathcal{M}_v^*)]_{\text{loc}}$.*

In the L^2 setting, Fourier methods yielding explicit regularity estimates on the velocity averages can be obtained. More explicitly, given a $\phi\in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d_v)$, we define the velocity averaged process by

$$\langle f,\phi\rangle(t,x;\omega)=\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(t,x,v;\omega)\phi(v)\,\mathrm{d}v.$$

Using an extension of the method outlined in [9], the following spatial regularity estimate on $\langle f,\phi\rangle$ can be established.

Lemma 4.4. *Let f be a weak martingale solution to the stochastic kinetic equation driven by g, with initial data f_0 relative to noise coefficients σ satisfying Hypothesis 1.2. If $f,g\in L^2(\Omega;L^2_{t,x,v})$ and $f_0\in L^2_{x,v}$, then for any $\phi\in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d_v)$,*

$$\mathbb{E}\|\langle f,\phi\rangle\|^2_{L^2_t(H^{1/6}_x)}\leq C_{\phi,\sigma}\Big(\|f_0\|^2_{L^2_{x,v}}+\mathbb{E}\|f\|^2_{L^2_{t,x,v}}+\mathbb{E}\|g\|^2_{L^2_{t,x,v}}\Big).$$

The proof is technical and left to Appendix C. We are now equipped to prove Lemma 4.3:

Proof of Lemma 4.3. Let $\phi\in C_c(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be arbitrary. In view of Lemma B.3 it suffices to show that $\{\langle f_n,\phi\rangle\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ induces tight laws on $[L^2_{t,x}]_{loc}$. We proceed by explicitly constructing sets $(K_\ell)_{\ell>0}$ which are compact in $[L^2_{t,x}]_{loc}$ such that

$$\lim_{\ell\to\infty}\sup_n\mathbb{P}\{\langle f_n,\phi\rangle\notin K_\ell\}=0.$$

Let $\{\varphi_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ be a dense subset of L^2_x and $\{N_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a positive, real-valued sequence to be selected later. Define the sets

$$E_\ell=\Big\{\rho\in L^2_{t,x}:\|\rho\|_{L^2_t(H^{1/6}_x)}\leq\ell\Big\},$$
$$F_\ell=\bigcap_{j=1}^\infty\Big\{\rho\in L^2_{t,x}:\|\langle\rho,\varphi_j\rangle\|_{W^{\gamma,p}_t}\leq(\ell N_j)^{\frac{1}{p}}\Big\},$$

where $p>4$ and $\gamma=\frac{1}{4}-\frac{1}{p}$. Let $K_\ell=E_\ell\cap F_\ell$ and observe this is a compact set in $[L^2_{t,x}]_{\text{loc}}$.

Applying the Chebyshev inequality followed by Lemma 4.4,

$$\mathbb{P}\Big\{\langle f_n,\phi\rangle \notin E_\ell\Big\} \leq \frac{1}{\ell}\mathbb{E}\|\langle f_n,\phi\rangle\|_{L^2_t(H^{1/6}_x)} \leq \frac{C_\phi}{\ell},$$

where C_ϕ depends on the uniform bounds for $\{f_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$, $\{g_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$, $\{f_n^0\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, and $\{\sigma^n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$. Similarly, for each $j\in\mathbb{N}$ we may appeal to Lemma 3.4 to find a constant C_{φ_j} (depending on the same uniform bounds) such that

$$\mathbb{P}\{\langle f_n,\phi\rangle \notin F_\ell\} \leq \sum_{j=1}^\infty \mathbb{P}\Big\{\Big\|\Big\langle\langle f_n,\phi\rangle,\varphi_j\Big\rangle\Big\|_{W^{\gamma,p}_t} < \ell N_j\Big\} \leq \sum_{j=1}^\infty \frac{C_{\varphi_j}}{\ell N_j}.$$

Choosing $N_j = 2^j C_{\varphi_j}$, we conclude that

$$\sup_n \mathbb{P}\{\langle f_n,\phi\rangle \notin K_\ell\} \leq \frac{1}{\ell}\sum_{j=1}^\infty 2^{-j} = \frac{1}{\ell}.$$

Taking $\ell\to\infty$ gives the result. □

4.2 Proof of Main lemma

In this section, we give the proof of the main result of the section, Lemma 4.2.

Proof of Lemma 4.2. Fix $\varepsilon>0$, and let $\{L_m\}_{m\in\mathbb{N}}$ be an unbounded sequences in $\mathbb{R}_+$, to be chosen later. For each $n\in\mathbb{N}$, we begin by decomposing f_n as

$$f_n = f_n^{\leq L_m} + f_n^{>L_m},$$

such that the following hold:

1. $f_n^{\leq L_m}$ is a weak martingale solution to the stochastic kinetic equation driven by $g_n\mathbb{1}_{|g_n|\leq L_m}$ with initial data $f_n^0\mathbb{1}_{|f_n^0|\leq L_m}$,
2. $f_n^{>L_m}$ is a weak martingale solution to the stochastic kinetic equation driven by $g_n\mathbb{1}_{|g_n|>L_m}$ with initial data $f_n^0\mathbb{1}_{|f_n^0|>L_m}$.

More specifically, both $f_n^{\leq L_m}$ and $f_n^{>L_m}$ can be built with respect to the same stochastic basis as f_n. Indeed, since $g_n\mathbb{1}_{|g_n|\leq L_m}$ belongs to $L^{\infty-}(\Omega;L^1_{t,x,v}\cap L^\infty_{t,x,v})$ by Hypothesis 4.1, we can build the above decomposition in the following way. First apply the existence result, Theorem 3.3 to obtain $f_n^{\leq L_m}$. Then by linearity (since both $f_n^{\leq L_m}$ can be built with respect to the same stochastic basis as f_n), the process $f_n^{>L_m} := f_n - f_n^{\leq L_m}$ must be driven by $g_n\mathbb{1}_{|g_n|>L_m}$ with initial data $f_n^0\mathbb{1}_{|f_n^0|\geq L_m}$. Moreover,

since f_n and $f_n^{\leq L_m}$ are both in $L^{\infty-}(\Omega \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^{2d})$, so is $f_n^{>L_m}$. In view of our assumptions on the noise coefficients made in Hypothesis 4.1 we may apply Proposition 3.8 to deduce that $f_n^{>L_m}$ is renormalized.

Our next step is to choose the sequence $\{L_m\}_{m\in\mathbb{N}}$ and estimate the sequence $\{f_n^{>L_m}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$. Since $f_n^{>L_m}$ is renormalized, the following inequality holds $\mathbb{P}$ almost surely:

$$\|f_n^{>L_m}\|_{L^1_{t,x,v}} \leq \|f_n^0 \mathbb{1}_{|f_0^n|>L_m}\|_{L^1_{x,v}} + \|g_n \mathbb{1}_{|g_n|>L_m}\|_{L^1_{t,x,v}}$$

Since Hypothesis 4.1 gives uniform integrability of $\{f_n^0\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, there exists a positive, unbounded sequence $\{L_{m,1}\}_{m\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that

$$\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \|f_n^0 \mathbb{1}_{|f_0^n|>L_{m,1}}\|_{L^1_{x,v}} \leq \frac{1}{2m}.$$

Moreover, since $\{g_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ induces a tight family of laws on $[L^1_{t,x,v}]_{w,\mathrm{loc}}$, it follows that for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a uniformly integrable subset K_m of $L^1_{t,x,v}$ such that

$$\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \mathbb{P}(g_n \notin K_m) \leq \varepsilon 2^{-m}.$$

In particular, there exists a positive, unbounded sequence $\{L_{m,2}\}_{m\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that

$$\sup_{g\in K_m} \|g \mathbb{1}_{|g|>L_{m,2}}\|_{L^1_{t,x,v}} \leq \frac{1}{2m}.$$

Setting $L_m = \max(L_{m,1}, L_{m,2})$, we find that

$$\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \mathbb{P}(\|f_n^{>L_m}\|_{L^1_{t,x,v}} \geq m^{-1}) \leq \varepsilon 2^{-m}. \tag{41}$$

The next step is to apply our L^2 velocity averaging lemma to the sequence $\{f_n^{\leq M}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$. Towards this end, note that $\{f_n^0 \mathbb{1}_{|f_n^0|\leq L_m}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is bounded in $L^2_{x,v}$ (by interpolation) and $\{g_n \mathbb{1}_{|g_n|\leq L_m}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is bounded in $L^{\infty-}(\Omega \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^{2d})$. By the estimate given in Theorem 3.3, $\{f_n^{\leq L_m}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is also bounded in $L^{\infty-}(\Omega \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^{2d})$. Therefore we may apply Lemma 4.3 to produce, for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$, a compact set E_m in $[L^2_{t,x}(\mathcal{M}_v^*)]_{\mathrm{loc}}$, such that

$$\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \mathbb{P}\{f_n^{\leq L_m} \notin E_m\} \leq 2^{-m}\varepsilon. \tag{42}$$

Finally, introduce the set

$$U = \{f \in L^1_{t,x,v} : \|(1+|x|^2+|v|^2) f\|_{L^1_{t,x,v}} \leq \varepsilon^{-1}\},$$

and use the uniform bound (40) to deduce

$$\mathbb{P}\{f_n \notin U\} \leq C\varepsilon. \tag{43}$$

The next step is to define precisely the compact set K in $L^1_{t,x}(\mathcal{M}^*_v)$ that will carry the bulk of the probability. Towards this end, denote the $L^1_{t,x,v}$ ball, B_m by

$$B_m = \{f \in L^1_{t,x,v} : \|f\|_{L^1_{t,x,v}} \leq 1/m\}.$$

and introduce the set

$$H = \bigcap_{m=1}^{\infty} (E_m + B_m).$$

We claim that H is compact in $[L^1_{t,x}(\mathcal{M}^*_v)]_{\text{loc}}$. To verify this, we will appeal to Lemmas B.2 and B.1. Indeed, let $\{\phi_m\}_{m=1}^{\infty}$ be a dense subset of $C_c(\mathbb{R}^d_v)$, and define for each $j \geq 1$, $\Pi_{\phi_j} f = \langle f, \phi_j \rangle$. Since E_m is compact in $[L^1_{t,x}(\mathcal{M}^*_v)]_{\text{loc}}$, $\Pi_{\phi_j} E_m$ is compact in $[L^1_{t,x}]_{\text{loc}}$. Also, since $\Pi_{\phi_j} B_m$ is a ball of radius $\|\phi_j\|_{L^\infty_x}/m$ in $L^1_{t,x}$, by Lemma B.1 we conclude that

$$\Pi_{\phi_j} H = \bigcap_{m=1}^{\infty} (\Pi_{\phi_j} E_m + \Pi_{\phi_j} B_m),$$

is compact in $[L^1_{t,x}]_{\text{loc}}$. Since this is true for each $j \geq 1$, and the set H is bounded in $[L^1_{t,x}(\mathcal{M}_v)]_{\text{loc}}$, Lemma B.2 allows us to conclude that H is compact in $[L^1_{t,x}(\mathcal{M}^*_v)]_{\text{loc}}$. By defining $K = H \cap U$, we may remove the 'loc' specification and conclude that K is compact in $L^1_{t,x}(\mathcal{M}^*_v)$.

The final step is to combine our estimates and verify

$$\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{P}\{f_n \notin K\} = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon).$$

Indeed, first observe the elementary inequality

$$\mathbb{P}\{f_n \notin K\} \leq \mathbb{P}\{f_n \notin U\} + \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}\{f_n \notin E_m + B_m\}. \tag{44}$$

Moreover, in view of the inclusion

$$\{f_n \notin E_m + B_m\} \subseteq \{f_n^{\leq L_m} \notin E_m\} \cup \{f_n^{> L_m} \notin B_m\},$$

we can bound

$$\mathbb{P}\{f_n \notin E_m + B_m\} \leq \mathbb{P}\{f_n^{\leq L_m} \notin E_m\} + \mathbb{P}\{f_n^{> L_m} \notin B_m\}. \tag{45}$$

Finally, we can combine our 3 key estimates (41), (42), and (43) with the elementary inequalities (44) and (45) to deduce that

$$\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{P}\{f_n \notin K\} \leq C\varepsilon \left(1 + \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} 2^{-m}\right) = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon),$$

as desired. □

5 Approximating Scheme

There are two main goals in this section. First, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ fixed we will construct a renormalized weak martingale solution to the SPDE

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t f_n + v \cdot \nabla_x f_n + \operatorname{div}_v(f_n \sigma_k^n \circ \dot{\beta}_k) = \mathcal{B}_n(f,f) \\ f_n \mid_{t=0} = f_n^0, \end{cases} \tag{46}$$

where the initial datum f_n^0 and the noise coefficients σ^n are sufficiently regular, and $\mathcal{B}_n$ is an approximation to $\mathcal{B}$ involving a truncation and a regularized collision kernel b_n. The second goal is to rigorously establish the uniform bounds on $\{f_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ obtained formally in Section 2. Towards this end, our regularizations are chosen to satisfy the following hypotheses.

Hypothesis 5.1. *For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, f_n^0 is smooth, non-negative and bounded from above. Moreover, for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $(1+|x|^2+|v|^2)^j f_0^n \in L^1_{x,v}$. Also, there exists a constant C_n such that for all $(x,v) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$, the lower bound $\log f_n^0(x,v) \geq \log C_n - (|x|^2+|v|^2)$ holds true.*

Moreover, the sequence $\{(1+|x|^2+|v|^2+|\log f_n^0|) f_n^0)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded in $L^1_{x,v}$ and $\{f_n^0\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges to f_0 strongly in $L^1_{x,v}$.

Hypothesis 5.2. *For each $k,n \in \mathbb{N}$, the noise coefficient $\sigma_k^n \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{2d};\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\operatorname{div}_v \sigma_k^n = 0$. In addition, for $k > n$, the noise coefficient σ_k^n vanishes identically.*

Moreover, the sequences $\{\sigma^n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $\{\sigma^n \cdot \nabla_v \sigma^n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converge to σ and $\sigma \cdot \nabla_v \sigma$ in the spaces $\ell^2(\mathbb{N};L^\infty_{x,v})$ and $\ell^1(\mathbb{N};L^\infty_{x,v})$ respectively.

Hypothesis 5.3. *For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, b_n is smooth, compactly supported in $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ and satisfies Hypothesis 1.1.*

Moreover, the sequence $\{b_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is bounded in $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1})$ and converges strongly to b in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1})$.

Following DiPerna/Lions [17], the truncated collision operator $\mathcal{B}_n$ is defined for $f \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d_v)$ by

$$\mathcal{B}_n(f,f) = \left(1 + n^{-1}\langle f, 1\rangle\right)^{-1} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1}} (f' f_*' - f f_*) b_n(v - v_*, \theta) \mathrm{d}v_* \mathrm{d}\theta.$$

The following lemma provides the necessary boundedness and continuity properties of the operator $\mathcal{B}_n$. The method of proof is classical, see [17] or [13] for most of the ideas.

Lemma 5.4. *For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a constant C_n such that*

1. *For all $f, g \in L^1_{x,v}$ it holds:*

$$\|\mathcal{B}_n(f,f) - \mathcal{B}_n(g,g)\|_{L^1_{x,v}} \leq C_n \|f - g\|_{L^1_{x,v}}.$$

2. *For all f such that $(1+|x|^2+|v|^2)^k f \in L^1_{x,v}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, it holds*

$$\|(1+|x|^2+|v|^2)^k \mathcal{B}_n(f,f)\|_{L^1_{x,v}} \leq C_n \|(1+|x|^2+|v|^2)^k f\|_{L^1_{x,v}}.$$

3. *For all $f \in L^\infty_{x,v}$ it holds:*

$$\|\mathcal{B}_n(f,f)\|_{L^\infty_{x,v}} \leq C_n \|f\|_{L^\infty_{x,v}}.$$

The strategy for solving the SPDE (46) involves a sequence of successive approximations based on mild formulation of (46) in terms of stochastic flows. Namely, we fix a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ and a collection of independent, one dimensional Brownian motions $\{\beta_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$. The filtration generated by the Brownian motions is denoted $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t=0}^T$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, Hypothesis 5.2 allows us to apply the results of Kunita [33] to obtain a collection of stochastic flows $(\Phi_t^n)_{t=0}^T$ associated to the Stratanovich SDE

$$\mathrm{d}X_t^{n,x,v} = V_t^{n,x,v}\mathrm{d}t, \quad \mathrm{d}V_t^{n,x,v} = \sum_{j=1}^n \sigma_j^n(X_t^{n,x,v}) \circ \mathrm{d}\beta_j, \quad (X_0^{n,x,v}, V_0^{n,x,v}) = (x,v),$$

where $\Phi_t^n(x,v) = (X_t^{n,x,v}, V_t^{n,x,v})$. The corresponding inverse stochastic flows are denoted $(\Psi_t^n)_{t=0}^T$. These objects have been studied at length by Kunita [33], so we will mostly defer to this reference for proofs of their properties. The main fact needed for our purposes concerns the following $\mathbb{P}$ almost sure growth estimates for the flow and inverse flow maps. We do not comment on the optimality of these rates, since this is unnecessary for our purpose.

Lemma 5.5. *Let $\varepsilon > 0$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the following limits holds $\mathbb{P}$ almost surely:*

$$\lim_{(x,v)\to\infty} \sup_{t\in[0,T]} \frac{|\Phi_t^n(x,v)|^2}{(1+|x|^2+|v|^2)^{1+\varepsilon}} = 0.$$

$$\lim_{(x,v)\to\infty} \sup_{t\in[0,T]} \frac{|\Psi_t^n(x,v)|^2}{(1+|x|^2+|v|^2)^{1+\varepsilon}} = 0.$$

Proof. For simplicity of notation, we omit dependence of the stochastic flow on $n \in \mathbb{N}$ for the remainder of the proof. We only sketch the proof since it follows closely the method used in Kunita [33], simply adapted to treat a drift with linear growth. Begin by applying the Ito formula to find (using the Einstein summation convention)

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2}\left(|X_t^{x,v}|^2 + |V_t^{x,v}|^2\right) &= \frac{1}{2}\left(|x|^2+|v|^2\right) + \int_0^t X_s^{x,v}\cdot V_s^{x,v}\mathrm{d}s \\ &+ \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \int_0^t \left[\sigma_k \cdot \nabla_v \sigma_k(X_s^{x,v}, V_s^{x,v})\cdot V_s^{x,v} + \frac{1}{2}|\sigma_k(X_s^{x,v}, V_s^{x,v})|^2\right]\mathrm{d}s \\ &+ \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \int_0^t V_t^{x,v}\cdot \sigma_k(X_s^{x,v}, V_s^{x,v})\mathrm{d}\beta_k(s).\end{aligned}$$

Applying the BDG inequality, using Hypothesis 5.2 about the regularized noise coefficients, and applying the Gronwall lemma gives for $p \in (1,\infty)$

$$\mathbb{E}\Big(\sup_{t\in[0,T]} |X_t^{x,v}|^2 + |V_t^{x,v}|^2 \Big)^p \leq C(1+|x|^2+|v|^2)^p.$$

The constant C is independent of $x, v \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Hence, for each $\varepsilon > 0$, we find that

$$\mathbb{E}\Big(\sup_{t\in[0,T]} \frac{|X_t^{x,v}|^2 + |V_t^{x,v}|^2}{(1+|x|^2+|v|^2)^{1+\varepsilon}} \Big)^p \leq C(1+|x|^2+|v|^2)^{-\varepsilon p}.$$

Applying the multi-dimensional Kolmogorov continuity theorem to the random field

$$(x,v) \to \sup_{t\in[0,T]} \frac{|X_t^{x,v}|^2 + |V_t^{x,v}|^2}{(1+|x|^2+|v|^2)^{1+\varepsilon}},$$

we obtain

$$\lim_{(x,v)\to\infty} \sup_{t\in[0,T]} \frac{|\Phi_t^n(x,v)|^2}{(1+|x|^2+|v|^2)^{1+\varepsilon}} = 0.$$

A similar argument for the corresponding backwards SDE gives the estimate on the inverse flow map. See Kunita [33] for more details. □

Our next step is to apply Lemmas 5.4 and 5.5 to establish the following existence result.

Proposition 5.6. *For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a renormalized weak martingale solution f_n to a stochastic kinetic equation driven by $\mathcal{B}_n(f_n, f_n)$, starting from f_n^0, relative to the noise coefficient σ^n. Each f_n has the following properties:*

1. *$f_n \in L^\infty(\Omega; L^1_{t,x,v} \cap L^\infty_{t,x,v})$.*
2. *For all $j \in \mathbb{N}$, $(1+|x|^2+|v|^2)^j f_n \in L^{\infty-}(\Omega; L^1_{t,x,v})$.*
3. *There exists a constant $\overline{C}_n$ such that for each $t \in [0,T]$, $\mathbb{P}$ almost surely*

$$f_n(t) \geq e^{-\overline{C}_n t} f_n^0 \circ \Psi_t^n. \tag{47}$$

Moreover, the sequence and $\{(1+|x|^2+|v|^2) f_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded in $L^{\infty-}\Big(\Omega; L^\infty_t(L^1_{x,v})\Big)$.

Proof. Begin by constructing a sequence of successive approximations $\{f_n^k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$. For each $k\in\mathbb{N}$, define $\{f_n^k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ over $[0,T]$ by the relation

$$f_n^k(t) = f_n^0 \circ \Psi_t^n + \int_0^t \mathcal{B}_n\Big(f_n^{k-1}(s), f_n^{k-1}(s)\Big) \circ \Psi_{t-s}^n ds. \tag{48}$$

Applying classical results of Kunita [33], it follows that f_n^k is a weak martingale solution to the stochastic kinetic equation driven by $\mathcal{B}_n(f_n^{k-1}, f_n^{k-1})$, starting from f_n^0, relative to the noise coefficient σ^n.

Let $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t=0}^T$ be the filtration generated by the collection of Brownian motions $\{\beta_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$. Let X_T be the Banach space of $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t=0}^T$ progressively measurable processes $f:[0,T]\times\Omega\to L^1_{x,v}$ endowed with the $L^2(\Omega;C_t(L^1_{x,v}))$ norm. Let C_n be the constant corresponding to the continuity estimates for $\mathcal{B}_n$ from Lemma 5.4. In addition, observe that the Hypothesis $\operatorname{div}_v \sigma_k^n = 0$ implies that for almost every $(\omega,t)\in\Omega\times[0,T]$, the flow map $\Phi_t(\omega)$ is volume preserving (see Kunita [33] for more details). Taking $L^1_{x,v}$ norms on both sides of (48), maximizing over $[0,T]$, and using the Lipschitz continuity of $\mathcal{B}_n$ in $L^1_{x,v}$ obtained in 5.4, we find $\|f_n^{k+1} - f_n^k\|_{X_T} \le (C_nT)^k$ for each $k\in\mathbb{N}$. By the triangle inequality, if $T < C_n^{-1}$, then the sequence $\{f_n^k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ is Cauchy in X_T. Applying this argument a finite number of times, we may remove the constraint on T. Hence, for each $n\in\mathbb{N}$, there exists an $f_n\in X_T$ such that $\{f_n^k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges to f_n in the space $L^2(\Omega;C_t(L^1_{x,v}))$. In view of Lemma 5.4, $\mathcal{B}_n$ is continuous in $L^2(\Omega;C_t(L^1_{x,v}))$. Hence, we have more than enough to appeal to our stability result Proposition 3.5 and deduce that for each $n\in\mathbb{N}$, the process f_n is a weak martingale solution to the stochastic kinetic equation driven by $\mathcal{B}_n(f_n,f_n)$, relative to the noise coefficients σ^n and starting from f_n^0.

Our next step is to verify the lower bound (47). Let $\overline{C}_n$ be a deterministic constant to be selected. In view of (48) and the fact that $\Psi_{t-s}^n\circ\Phi_t^n = \Phi_s^n$ for $s<t$, the following inequalities hold $\mathbb{P}$ almost surely:

$$\begin{aligned}
e^{\overline{C}_n t} f_n^{k+1}(t)\circ\Phi_t^n &= f_0^n + \int_0^t e^{\overline{C}_n s}\mathcal{B}_n\Big(f_n^k(s), f_n^k(s)\Big)\circ\Phi_s^n \mathrm{d}s + \overline{C}_n\int_0^t e^{\overline{C}_n s} f_n^k(s)\circ\Phi_s^n \mathrm{d}s \\
&\ge f_0^n - \int_0^t e^{\overline{C}_n s}\mathcal{B}_n^-\Big(f_n^k(s), f_n^k(s)\Big)\circ\Phi_s^n \mathrm{d}s + \overline{C}_n\int_0^t e^{\overline{C}_n s} f_n^k(s)\circ\Phi_s^n \mathrm{d}s \\
&\ge f_0^n + [\overline{C}_n - n|\overline{b}_n|_{L^\infty_v}]\int_0^t e^{\overline{C}_n s} f_n^k(s)\circ\Phi_s^n \mathrm{d}s.
\end{aligned}$$

In the last line, we used the explicit definition of the operator $\mathcal{B}_n^-$ together with Young's inequality and the fact that the flow map is volume preserving. Choose $\overline{C}_n > n|\overline{b}_n|_{L^\infty_v}$ and apply the inequality above inductively to obtain the non-negativity of $f_n^k(t)\circ\Phi_t^n$, which yields $e^{\overline{C}_n t} f_n^{k+1}(t)\circ\Phi_t^n \ge f_0^n$. Passing $k\to\infty$ and using the $L^2(\Omega;C_t(L^1_{x,v}))$ convergence of $\{f_k^n\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ towards f_n, we find that $e^{\overline{C}_n t} f_n(t)\circ\Phi_t^n \ge f_0^n$ for all $t\in[0,T]$ with probability one. Composing with Ψ_t^n on both sides gives the desired lower bound (47).

Our next step is to check that the sequence $\{f_n^k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly (in k only) bounded in $L^\infty(\Omega\times[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^{2d})$. By Hypothesis 5.1, f_n^0 is bounded. Taking $L^\infty_{x,v}$ norms on both sides of (48), then maximizing over $t\in[0,T]$ yields $\mathbb{P}$ almost surely

$$\|f_n^{k+1}\|_{C([0,T];L^\infty_{x,v})}\leq\|f_n^0\|_{L^\infty_{x,v}}+C_nT\|f_n^k\|_{C([0,T];L^\infty_{x,v})},$$

where C_n is the constant from Lemma 5.4. Iterating, we find that for $T<C_n^{-1}$,

$$\|f_n^k\|_{C([0,T];L^\infty_{x,v})}\leq(1-C_nT)^{-1}\|f_n^0\|_{L^\infty_{x,v}}.$$

Repeating the argument a finite number of times, we obtain $\|f_n^k\|_{C([0,T];L^\infty_{x,v})}\lesssim 1$ with probability one. Taking $L^\infty(\Omega)$ norms on both sides yields the claim.

Our next goal is to establish the following uniform estimate: for all $p\in(1,\infty)$

$$\sup_{k,n\in\mathbb{N}}\mathbb{E}\|(1+|x|^2+|v|^2)f_n^k\|^p_{L^\infty_x(L^1_v)}\leq C_p,$$

where C_p depends only on f_0 and σ. If the process $(1+|x|^2+|v|^2)f_n^k$ was known to belong in $L^{\infty-}(\Omega;C_t(L^1_{x,v}))$, we could argue exactly as in the formal estimates section. Since this is a priori unknown, we proceed by a stopping time argument based on the characteristics. In the arguments that follow, for simplicity of notation, we will omit dependence of the stochastic flow on the parameter n. Define

$$\tau_R=\inf\left\{t\in[0,T]\mid\left\|\sup_{s\in[0,t]}\frac{|X_s^{x,v}|^2+|V_s^{x,v}|^2}{(1+|x|^2+|v|^2)^2}\right\|_{L^\infty_{x,v}}\geq R\right\}.$$

For $t\in[0,T]$ let $f_n^{k,R}(t)=f_n^k(t\wedge\tau_R)$. We will verify that for each $k,n\in\mathbb{N}$ and $R>0$, the process $(1+|x|^2+|v|^2)^j f_n^{k,R}$ belongs to the space $L^{\infty-}(\Omega;C_t(L^1_{x,v}))$ for all $j>1$. The claim will be established by induction on $k\in\mathbb{N}$. Suppose the claim is true for step k. To check $k+1$, note the

inequalities

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|(1+|x|^2+|v|^2)^j f_n^{k,R}(t)\|_{L^1_{x,v}} \\
&\quad\le \|(1+|x|^2+|v|^2)^j f_n^0 \circ \Psi_{t\wedge\tau_R}\|_{L^1_{x,v}} \\
&\qquad + \int_0^{t\wedge\tau_R} \Big\|(1+|x|^2+|v|^2)^j \mathcal{B}_n\Big(f_n^{k-1}(s), f_n^{k-1}(s)\Big)\circ \Psi_{t\wedge\tau_R - s}\Big\|_{L^1_{x,v}} \mathrm{d}s \\
&\quad= \|(1+|X^{x,v}_{t\wedge\tau_R}|^2+|V^{x,v}_{t\wedge\tau_R}|^2)^j f_n^0\|_{L^1_{x,v}} \\
&\qquad + \int_0^{t\wedge\tau_R} \Big\|(1+|X^{x,v}_{t\wedge\tau_R - s}|^2+|V^{x,v}_{t\wedge\tau_R - s}|^2)^j \mathcal{B}_n\Big(f_n^{k-1}(s), f_n^{k-1}(s)\Big)\Big\|_{L^1_{x,v}} \mathrm{d}s \\
&\quad\lesssim R^j \|(1+|x|^2+|v|^2)^{2j} f_n^0\|_{L^1_{x,v}} \\
&\qquad + R^j \int_0^{T\wedge\tau_R} \Big\|(1+|x|^2+|v|^2)^j \mathcal{B}_n\Big(f_n^{k-1}(s), f_n^{k-1}(s)\Big)\Big\|_{L^1_{x,v}} \mathrm{d}s \\
&\quad\lesssim 1 + \|(1+|x|^2+|v|^2)^{2j} f_n^{k-1,R}\|_{C_t(L^1_{x,v})}.
\end{aligned}$$

In the second inequality, we used that the stochastic flow is volume preserving. In the third and fourth inequalities, we used Lemma 5.4 and the definition of the stopping time, respectively. Taking $L^p(\Omega)$ norms on both sides and using the inductive hypothesis completes the inductive step. The base case is established in the same way. This completes the proof of the claim.

In particular, for $j = 1$, it is straightforward to argue as in the formal a priori bounds section to find for all $R > 0$

$$\|(1+|x|^2+|v|^2) f_n^k\|_{C([0,T\wedge\tau_R];L^1_{x,v})} \le C_p.$$

Now we wish to send $R \to \infty$ on both sides of this inequality. Towards this end, note that Lemma 5.5 implies that $\mathbb{P}$ almost surely,

$$\left\| \sup_{s\in[0,T]} \frac{|X_s^{x,v}|^2+|V_s^{x,v}|^2}{(1+|x|^2+|v|^2)^2} \right\|_{L^\infty_{x,v}} < \infty.$$

Hence, we find that

$$\lim_{R\to\infty} \mathbb{P}(\tau_R \le T) = \lim_{R\to\infty} \mathbb{P}\left(\left\| \sup_{s\in[0,T]} \frac{|X_s^{x,v}|^2+|V_s^{x,v}|^2}{(1+|x|^2+|v|^2)^2} \right\|_{L^\infty_{x,v}} \ge R \right) = 0.$$

Therefore, it follows that $\tau_R \wedge T$ converges in probability to T, and by the monotone convergence theorem we deduce that

$$\mathbb{E}\|(1+|x|^2+|v|^2) f_n^k\|^p_{C([0,T];L^1_{x,v})} \le C_p.$$

A slightly variation of the argument given in the a priori estimates implies for any $j \in \mathbb{N}$, the sequence $\{(1+|x|^2+|v|^2)^j f_k^n\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ is controlled uniformly (in k only) in $L^{\infty-}(\Omega; L^\infty_t(L^1_{x,v}))$. This completes the proof. □

The final step is to realize the a priori estimates obtained from the formal entropy dissipation inequality (7). Towards this end, define the approximate entropy dissipation $f \to \mathcal{D}_n(f)$ by the relation

$$\mathcal{D}_n(f) \equiv \frac{1}{4}\Big(1+n^{-1}\langle f,1\rangle\Big)^{-1} \iiint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}\times\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} d(f)\, b_n(v-v_*,\theta)\,\mathrm{d}\theta\mathrm{d}v_*\mathrm{d}v,$$

where $d(f)$ is defined by (8). Similarly, define $\mathcal{D}_n^0(f)$ by

$$\mathcal{D}_n^0(f) \equiv \frac{1}{4}(1+n^{-1}\langle f,1\rangle)^{-1} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{d}\times\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} d(f) b_n(v-v_*,\theta)\mathrm{d}\theta\mathrm{d}v_*.$$

Lemma 5.7. *Let $\{f_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be the sequence constructed in Proposition 5.6. For each $p\in(1,\infty)$, there exists a constant C_p depending on σ and f_0 such that*

$$\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E}\| f_n\log f_n\|^p_{L^\infty_t(L^1_{x,v})} \le C_p, \quad \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E}\|\mathcal{D}_n(f_n)\|^p_{L^1_{t,x}} \le C_p.$$

Proof. Begin by fixing $n\in\mathbb{N}$. Note that it suffices to verify identity (22) from the formal a priori bounds section. For each $\varepsilon>0$, we define the renormalization $\beta_\varepsilon(x) = x\log(x+\varepsilon)$. Using Proposition 3.8 and the fact that f_n belongs to $L^\infty(\Omega\times[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^{2d})$ and $L^2(\Omega;C_t(L^1_x))$, it can be checked with a truncation argument that $\beta_\varepsilon(f_n)$ is a weak martingale solution to the stochastic kinetic equation driven by $\beta'_\varepsilon(f_n)\mathcal{B}_n(f_n,f_n)$, starting from $\beta_\varepsilon(f_0^n)$. In particular, we obtain the $\mathbb{P}$ almost sure identity

$$\iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \beta_\varepsilon(f_n(t))\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}v = \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \beta_\varepsilon(f_n^0)\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}v + \int_0^t \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \beta'_\varepsilon(f_n)\mathcal{B}_n(f_n,f_n)\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}v\mathrm{d}s.$$

Observe that almost everywhere in $\Omega\times[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^{2d}$, as $\varepsilon\to0$ we have the convergence $\beta_\varepsilon(f_n(t))\to f_n\log f_n(t)$ and $\beta'_\varepsilon(f_n)\mathcal{B}_n(f_n,f_n)\to[1+\log f_n]\mathcal{B}_n(f_n,f_n)$. Since f_n is in $L^\infty(\Omega\times[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^{2d})$ and in $L^2(\Omega;C_t(L^1_x))$, it follows that $\mathbb{P}$ almost surely, for each $t\in[0,T]$

$$\iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \beta_\varepsilon(f_n(t))\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}v \to \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} f_n(t)\log f_n(t)\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}v. \tag{49}$$

The initial data are also handled similarly in view of Hypothesis 5.1. To pass the limit in the remaining integral on the RHS of (49), note that $|\beta'_\varepsilon(x)|\le(2+|\log(x)|)$ for ε small. Hence, by the dominated convergence theorem, it suffices to show that $\log f_n\mathcal{B}_n(f_n,f_n)$ belongs to $L^1_{t,x,v}$ with probability one. However, by Proposition 5.6 combined with Hypothesis 5.1 we have

$$C_n e^{-\overline{C}_n t}e^{-|\Psi^n_t|^2} \le f_n \le \|f_n\|_{L^\infty(\Omega\times[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^{2d})}.$$

In view of Lemma 5.5 it follows that $\mathbb{P}$ almost surely

$$\sup_{(x,v,t)\in\mathbb{R}^{2d}\times[0,T]} \frac{|\log f_n(t,x,v)|}{(1+|x|^2+|v|^2)^2} < \infty.$$

Hence, the claim now follows from Lemma 5.4 and the fact that $(1+|x|^2+|v|^2)^2 f_n \in L^\infty_t(L^1_{x,v})$ with probability one. □

6 Compactness and Preliminary Renormalization

Let $\{\tilde{f}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be the sequence of renormalized weak martingale solutions to (46) constructed in Proposition 5.6. Denote the supporting stochastic basis by $(\tilde{\Omega},\tilde{\mathcal{F}},\tilde{\mathbb{P}},(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_t)_{t=0}^T,\{\tilde{\beta}_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}})$. In view of Proposition 5.6 and Lemma 5.7, we have the uniform bounds

$$\begin{aligned}&\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\tilde{\mathbb{E}}\|(1+|x|^2+|v|^2+|\log\tilde{f}_n|)\,\tilde{f}_n\|^p_{L^\infty_t(L^1_{x,v})}<\infty\\&\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\tilde{\mathbb{E}}\|\mathcal{D}_n(\tilde{f}_n)\|^p_{L^1_{t,x}}<\infty.\end{aligned}\tag{50}$$

In this section, we will deduce several key tightness results and apply our main stochastic velocity averaging Lemma 4.2. We will study the induced laws of the approximations $\{\tilde{f}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, the renormalized approximations $\{\Gamma(\tilde{f}_n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, and renormalized collision operators $\{\Gamma'(f_n)\mathcal{B}_n(\tilde{f}_n,\tilde{f}_n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$. The precise results are stated in Lemmas 6.5-6.9. Combining our tightness result with a recent extension of the Skorohod Theorem 3.3, we will obtain our main compactness result Proposition 6.1.

Towards this end, we introduce for each $m\in\mathbb{N}$ a truncation type renormalization Γ_m defined by

$$\Gamma_m(z)=\frac{z}{1+m^{-1}z}.\tag{51}$$

The main result of this section is the following compactness result.

Proposition 6.1. *There exists a new probability space $(\Omega,\mathcal{F},\mathbb{P})$ and a sequence of maps $\{\widetilde{T}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ from Ω to $\tilde{\Omega}$ with the following properties:*

1. *For each $n\in\mathbb{N}$, the map $\tilde{T}_n$ is measurable from $(\Omega,\mathcal{F})$ to $(\tilde{\Omega},\tilde{\mathcal{F}})$ and $(\tilde{T}_n)_{\#}\mathbb{P}=\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$.*

2. *The new sequence $\{f_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ defined by $f_n=\tilde{f}_n\circ\widetilde{T}_n$ satisfies the uniform bounds* (50) *with $\mathbb{E}$ replacing $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}$. Moreover, for all $\omega\in\Omega$, there exists a constant $C(\omega)$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned}&\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\|(1+|x|^2+|v|^2+|\log f_n(\omega)|)\,f_n(\omega)\|_{L^\infty_t(L^1_{x,v})}\le C(\omega).\\&\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\|\mathcal{D}_n(f_n)(\omega)\|_{L^1_{t,x}}\le C(\omega).\end{aligned}$$

3. *The new sequence $\{\beta^n_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ defined by $\beta^n_k=\tilde{\beta}^n_k\circ\widetilde{T}_n$ consists of one-dimensional Brownian motions on $(\Omega,\mathcal{F},\mathbb{P})$.*

4. *There exist random variables f and $\{\beta_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ with values in $C_t([L^1_{x,v}]_w)$ and $[C_t]^\infty$ respectively, such that the following convergences hold pointwise on Ω:*

$$\begin{aligned} f_n &\to f \quad \text{in} \quad L^1_{t,x}(\mathcal{M}^*_v)\cap C_t([L^1_{x,v}]_w).\\ \{\beta^n_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}} &\to \{\beta_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \quad \text{in} \quad [C_t]^\infty. \end{aligned}$$

5. *For each $m\in\mathbb{N}$, there exist auxiliary random variables $\overline{\Gamma_m(f)}$ and $\overline{\gamma_m(f)}$ in $C_t([L^1_{x,v}]_w)$ along with $\mathcal{B}^-_m$ and $\mathcal{B}^+_m$ in $L^1_{t,x,v}$ and $\overline{\mathcal{D}^0(f)}$ in $\mathcal{M}_{t,x,v}$ such that the following convergences hold pointwise on Ω:*

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_m(f_n) &\to \overline{\Gamma_m(f)} \quad \text{in} \quad L^1_{t,x}(\mathcal{M}^*_v)\cap C_t([L^1_{x,v}]_w).\\ \Gamma'_m(f_n)f_n &\to \overline{\gamma_m(f)} \quad \text{in} \quad L^1_{t,x}(\mathcal{M}^*_v)\cap C_t([L^1_{x,v}]_w).\\ \Gamma'_m(f_n)\mathcal{B}^+_n(f_n,f_n) &\to \mathcal{B}^+_m \quad \text{in} \quad [L^1_{t,x,v}]_w.\\ \Gamma'_m(f_n)\mathcal{B}^-_n(f_n,f_n) &\to \mathcal{B}^-_m \quad \text{in} \quad [L^1_{t,x,v}]_w\\ \mathcal{D}^0_n(f_n) &\to \overline{\mathcal{D}^0(f)} \quad \text{in} \quad \mathcal{M}^*_{t,x,v}. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 6.2. For all $n\in\mathbb{N}$, f_n is a weak martingale solution to the stochastic kinetic equation driven by $\mathcal{B}_n(f_n,f_n)$, starting from f_0, with noise coefficients σ^n. The supporting stochastic basis is given by $(\Omega,\mathcal{F},\mathbb{P},(\mathcal{F}^n_t)^T_{t=0},\{\beta^n_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}})$, where the Brownian motions are given by $\beta^n_k=\tilde\beta^n_k\circ\widetilde{T}_n$ and $\mathcal{F}^n_t=\tilde T_n^{-1}\circ\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_t$.

As our first application of Proposition 6.1, we send $n\to\infty$, but the limit passage is in a preliminary sense. Namely, we do not yet obtain the renormalized form for f, but we obtain a stochastic kinetic equation for a strong approximation $\overline{\Gamma_m(f)}$. In fact, using Proposition 6.1, we will prove:

Corollary 6.3. *For all $m\in\mathbb{N}$, the process $\overline{\Gamma_m(f)}$ is a weak martingale solution to the stochastic kinetic equation driven by $\mathcal{B}^+_m-\mathcal{B}^-_m$, starting from $\Gamma_m(f_0)$, with noise coefficients $\sigma=\{\sigma_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$.*

6.1 Tightness of renormalized quantities

In this section, we study the compactness properties of the sequences $\{\Gamma(\tilde f_n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $\{\Gamma'(\tilde f_n)\mathcal{B}^+_n(\tilde f_n,\tilde f_n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, where Γ is a renormalization of a particular type.

Definition 6.4. Let $\mathcal{R}'$ denote the class of renormalizations $\Gamma\in C^2(\mathbb{R}_+)$, such that $\Gamma(0)=0$ and

$$\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}_+}\Big(|\Gamma(x)|+(1+x)|\Gamma'(x)|+|\Gamma''(x)|\Big)<\infty.$$

Lemma 6.5. *For each $\Gamma\in\mathcal{R}'$, the sequences $\{\Gamma'(\tilde f_n)\mathcal{B}^-_n(\tilde f_n,\tilde f_n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $\{\Gamma'(\tilde f_n)\mathcal{B}^+_n(\tilde f_n,\tilde f_n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ are uniformly bounded in $L^{\infty-}(\tilde\Omega;L^1_{t,x,v})$.*

Proof. Let us begin with an estimate for $\{\Gamma'(\tilde{f}_n)\mathcal{B}_n^-(\tilde{f}_n,\tilde{f}_n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$. Since $\Gamma\in\mathcal{R}'$, the mapping $x\to(1+x)|\Gamma'(x)|$ is bounded on $\mathbb{R}_+$ Therefore, the following inequalities hold on $\tilde{\Omega}\times[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^{2d}$

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma'(\tilde{f}_n)\mathcal{B}_n^-(\tilde{f}_n,\tilde{f}_n)&\lesssim\frac{\mathcal{B}_n^-(\tilde{f}_n,\tilde{f}_n)}{1+f_n}\\&\lesssim\tilde{f}_n*\overline{b}_n,\end{aligned}$$

where the convolution is only in the variable v. Recall that the sequence $\{\overline{b}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^d_v)$. Integrating over $\tilde{\Omega}\times[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^{2d}$ and applying Young's inequality for convolutions yields

$$\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\mathbb{E}\|\Gamma'(\tilde{f}_n)\mathcal{B}_n^-(\tilde{f}_n,\tilde{f}_n)\|_{L^1_{t,x,v}}\lesssim\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\mathbb{E}\|\tilde{f}_n\|_{L^1_{t,x,v}}.\tag{52}$$

Now we can estimate $\{\Gamma'(\tilde{f}_n)\mathcal{B}_n^+(\tilde{f}_n,\tilde{f}_n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ by applying the Arkeryd bound (15) pointwise in $\tilde{\Omega}\times[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^{2d}$, then integrating in all variables to find

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\mathbb{E}\|\Gamma'(\tilde{f}_n)\mathcal{B}_n^+(\tilde{f}_n,\tilde{f}_n)\|_{L^1_{t,x,v}}&\lesssim 2\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\mathbb{E}\|\Gamma'(\tilde{f}_n)\mathcal{B}_n^-(\tilde{f}_n,\tilde{f}_n)\|_{L^1_{t,x,v}}+\frac{1}{\log 2}\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\mathbb{E}\|\mathcal{D}_n(\tilde{f}_n)\|_{L^1_{t,x,v}}\\&\lesssim\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\mathbb{E}\|\tilde{f}_n\|_{L^1_{t,x,v}}+\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\mathbb{E}\|\mathcal{D}_n(\tilde{f}_n)\|_{L^1_{t,x,v}},\end{aligned}\tag{53}$$

where we used (52) in the last line. In view of inequalities (52) and (53), the Proposition now follows from the uniform bounds (50). □

Lemma 6.6. *For each $\Gamma\in\mathcal{R}'$, the sequence $\{\Gamma'(\tilde{f}_n)\mathcal{B}_n^-(\tilde{f}_n,\tilde{f}_n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ induces tight laws on $[L^1_{t,x,v}]_w$.*

Proof. Effectively, we have to show that the renormalized collision sequence is bounded, uniformly integrable, and tight in $L^1_{t,x,v}$, with uniformly high probability. Towards this end, let $\Psi(t)=t|\log t|$. By classical arguments from [17], there exists a constant C depending only on Γ and $\|\overline{b}\|_{L^1_v}$ such that the following two inequalities hold. Regarding uniform integrability,

$$\int_0^T\iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}}\Psi\Big(\Gamma'(\tilde{f}_n)\mathcal{B}_n^-(\tilde{f}_n,\tilde{f}_n)\Big)\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}v\mathrm{d}s\le C\Big[\|\tilde{f}_n\|_{L^1_{t,x,v}}+\int_0^T\Psi(\tilde{f}_n)\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}v\mathrm{d}s\Big].\tag{54}$$

Moreover, regarding tightness (in $L^1_{t,x,v}$), for all $R>0$

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_0^T\iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}}1_{\{|x|+|v|>R\}}\Gamma'(\tilde{f}_n)\mathcal{B}_n^-(\tilde{f}_n,\tilde{f}_n)\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}v\mathrm{d}s\\&\qquad\le C\Big[\|\tilde{f}_n\|_{L^1_{t,x,v}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}1_{\{|v|>\frac{R}{2}\}}\overline{b}_n(v)\mathrm{d}v+R^{-2}\int_0^T\iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}}(|x|^2+|v|^2)\,\tilde{f}_n\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}v\mathrm{d}s\Big].\end{aligned}\tag{55}$$

Combining (54) and (55) with our uniform bounds, we find that:

$$\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\mathbb{E}\Big(\Big\|\psi\Big(\Gamma'(\tilde{f}_n)\mathcal{B}_n^-(\tilde{f}_n,\tilde{f}_n)\Big)\Big\|_{L^1_{t,x,v}}\Big)<\infty. \tag{56}$$

$$\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\mathbb{E}\left(\sup_{R>0}\Big[\lambda(R)\Big\|1_{\{|x|+|v|>R\}}\Gamma'(\tilde{f}_n)\mathcal{B}_n^-(\tilde{f}_n,\tilde{f}_n)\Big\|_{L^1_{t,x,v}}\Big]\right)<\infty, \tag{57}$$

where $\lambda:\mathbb{R}_+\to\mathbb{R}_+$, is an unbounded function. The unboundedness of λ, follows from the uniform integrability $\{\overline{b}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$. To construct our compact sets, note that for all $M>0$, the set

$$\left\{f\in L^1_{t,x,v}\mid \|f\|_{L^1_{t,x,v}}+\|\psi(f)\|_{L^1_{t,x,v}}+\sup_{R>0}\Big[\lambda(R)\|1_{\{|x|+|v|>R\}}f\|_{L^1_{t,x,v}}\Big]\le M\right\}$$

is weakly compact in $L^1_{t,x,v}$. Indeed, every sequence in this set is bounded, uniformly integrable, and tight in $L^1_{t,x,v}$. By Chebyshev, the uniform bounds (56), (57) and our previous Lemma 6.6, it follows that $\{\Gamma'(\tilde{f}_n)\mathcal{B}_n^-(\tilde{f}_n,\tilde{f}_n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ induces tight laws on $L^1_{t,x,v}$. □

Lemma 6.7. *For each* Γ*, the sequence* $\{\Gamma'(\tilde{f}_n)\mathcal{B}_n^+(\tilde{f}_n,\tilde{f}_n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ *induces tight laws on* $[L^1_{t,x,v}]_w$.

Proof. Let $\varepsilon>0$. By Lemma 6.6, we may select a weakly compact set K_ε^- in $L^1_{t,x,v}$ such that

$$\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\tilde{\mathbb{P}}\Big(\Gamma'(f_n)\mathcal{B}_n^-(\tilde{f}_n,\tilde{f}_n)\notin K_\varepsilon^-\Big)\le\frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$

Moreover, in view of the uniform bound on the entropy dissipation (50), we can select a closed ball, B_{M_ε} of size $M_\varepsilon>0$ in $L^1_{t,x,v}$ such that

$$\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\tilde{\mathbb{P}}\Big(\mathcal{D}_n(\tilde{f}_n)\notin B_{M_\varepsilon}\Big)\le\frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$

For each $j\in\mathbb{N}$, we define a set

$$K_{j,\varepsilon}=\Big\{f\in L^1_{t,x,v}\mid \text{There exists } g\in K_\varepsilon^- \text{ and } h\in B_{M_\varepsilon} \text{ such that } f\le jg+(\log j)^{-1}h\Big\}.$$

The inequality in the definition of $K_{j,\varepsilon}$ is understood to hold a.e. on $[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^{2d}$. Next define the set K_ε via

$$K_\varepsilon=\bigcap_{j\in\mathbb{N}}K_{j,\varepsilon}.$$

Note that if $\Gamma'(\tilde{f}_n)\mathcal{B}_n^-(\tilde{f}_n,\tilde{f}_n)\in K_\varepsilon^-$ and $\mathcal{D}_n(\tilde{f}_n)\in B_{M_\varepsilon}$, then by the Arkeryd bound (15), we find $\Gamma'(\tilde{f}_n)\mathcal{B}_n^+(\tilde{f}_n,\tilde{f}_n)\in K_\varepsilon$. It follows, by the contrapositive, that

$$\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\tilde{\mathbb{P}}\Big(\Gamma'(\tilde{f}_n)\mathcal{B}_n^+(\tilde{f}_n,\tilde{f}_n)\notin K_\varepsilon\Big)\le\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\tilde{\mathbb{P}}\Big(\Gamma'(\tilde{f}_n)\mathcal{B}_n^-(\tilde{f}_n,\tilde{f}_n)\notin K_\varepsilon^-\Big)+\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\tilde{\mathbb{P}}\Big(\mathcal{D}_n(\tilde{f}_n,\tilde{f}_n)\notin B_M\Big).$$

Since each term above is of order ε, the proof of the Lemma will be complete if we verify that K_ε is a weakly compact subset of $L^1_{t,x,v}$. By classical compactness criteria, it suffices to verify the following:

$$\lim_{R\to\infty}\sup_{f\in K_\varepsilon}\int_0^T\iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}}1_{\{|x|+|v|>R\}}|f|\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}v\mathrm{d}t=0. \tag{58}$$

$$\lim_{\delta\to 0}\sup_{f\in K_\varepsilon}\sup_{|E|\le\delta}\int_0^T\iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}}1_E|f|\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}v\mathrm{d}t=0 \tag{59}$$

To verify (58), note that for all $j\in\mathbb{N}$,

$$\sup_{f\in K_\varepsilon}\int_0^T\iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}}1_{\{|x|+|v|>R\}}|f|\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}v\mathrm{d}t\le j\sup_{g\in K_\varepsilon^-}\int_0^T\iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}}1_{\{|x|+|v|>R\}}|g|\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}v\mathrm{d}t+\frac{M_\varepsilon}{\log j}.$$

Taking j sufficiently large and using the $L^1_{t,x,v}$ weak compactness of K_ε^- yields (58). An entirely analogous argument gives (59). □

Lemma 6.8. *For each $\Gamma\in\mathcal{R}'$, the laws of $\{\Gamma(\tilde f_n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ are tight on $C_t([L^1_{x,v}]_w)\cap L^1_{t,x}(\mathcal{M}^*_v)$.*

Proof. First we will check that $\{\Gamma(\tilde f_n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ induces tight laws on the space $L^1_{t,x}(\mathcal{M}^*_v)$ by verifying the requirements of the L^1 velocity averaging Lemma 4.2.

Observe that for each $n\in\mathbb{N}$, $\Gamma(\tilde f_n)$ is a weak martingale solution to the stochastic kinetic equation driven by $\Gamma'(\tilde f_n)\mathcal{B}_n(\tilde f_n,\tilde f_n)$, starting from $\Gamma(\tilde f_n^0)$, with noise coefficients σ^n. By the results on the approximating scheme, we know that $\Gamma(\tilde f_n)$ and $\Gamma'(\tilde f_n)\mathcal{B}_n(\tilde f_n,\tilde f_n)$ belong to $L^{\infty-}(\Omega;L^1_{t,x,v}\cap L^\infty_{t,x,v})$ and $\Gamma(f_n^0)$ is in $L^1_{x,v}\cap L^\infty_{x,v}$. Also, by assumption, $\{\sigma^n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ satisfy Hypothesis 1.2 uniformly.

Next, by a classical argument in kinetic Theory, and using the fact that $|\Gamma(z)|\lesssim|z|$, one can show the following pointwise estimate holds for any function $f:\mathbb{R}^{2d}\to\mathbb{R}^+$,

$$|\Gamma(f)\log|\Gamma(f)||\lesssim f|\log f|+(|x|^2+|v|^2)f+e^{-\frac{1}{2}(|x|^2+|v|^2)}. \tag{60}$$

We conclude that since $\{(1+|x|^2+|v|^2+|\log f_n^0|)f_n^0\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded in $L^1_{x,v}$, the same is true for $\{\Gamma(f_n^0)\log\Gamma(f_n^0)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$. Similarly, the uniform estimates (50) imply that for $p\in[1,\infty)$

$$\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\tilde{\mathbb{E}}\left\|(1+|x|^2+|v|^2+|\log|\Gamma(\tilde f_n)||)\Gamma(\tilde f_n)\right\|^p_{L^\infty_t(L^1_{x,v})}<\infty. \tag{61}$$

Finally, Lemma 6.5 implies that $\{\Gamma'(\tilde f_n)\mathcal{B}_n(\tilde f_n,\tilde f_n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded in $L^{\infty-}(\Omega;L^1_{t,x,v})$. Hence we meet all the requirements of Lemma 4.2, and conclude that $\{\Gamma(\tilde f_n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ induces tight laws on $L^1_{t,x}(\mathcal{M}^*_v)$.

Next we will check that $\{\Gamma(\tilde{f}_n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ induces tight laws on the space $C_t([L^1_{x,v}]_w)$. By Lemma A.4 and (61), it suffices to show that for each $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$, the sequence $\{\langle\Gamma(\tilde{f}_n),\varphi\rangle\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ induces tight laws on $C[0,T]$. To see this, use the weak form to obtain the decomposition $\langle\Gamma(\tilde{f}_n),\varphi\rangle = I^{n,1}+I^{n,2}$, where the continuous processes $(I^{n,1}_t)_{t=0}^T$ and $(I^{n,2}_t)_{t=0}^T$ are defined via:

$$\begin{aligned}
I^{n,1}_t &= \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \Gamma(f^0_n)\varphi \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}v + \int_0^t \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \Gamma(\tilde{f}_n)[v\cdot\nabla_x\varphi + \mathcal{L}_\sigma\varphi]\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}v\mathrm{d}s \\
&\qquad + \sum_{k=1}^\infty \int_0^t \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \Gamma(\tilde{f}_n)\sigma_k\cdot\nabla_v\varphi\,\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}v\mathrm{d}\beta_k(s).\\
I^{n,2}_t &= \int_0^t \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \Gamma'(\tilde{f}_n)\mathcal{B}_n(\tilde{f}_n,\tilde{f}_n)\varphi \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}v\mathrm{d}s.
\end{aligned}$$

Arguing as in Lemma 3.4, using the uniform bounds, and a Sobolev embedding, there exists an an $\alpha>0$ and $p>1$ such that $\{I^{n,1}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a bounded sequence in $L^p(\tilde{\Omega};C^\alpha_t)$. Next observe that by Lemmas 6.6 and 6.7, the sequence $\{\partial_t I^{n,2}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ induces tight laws on $L^1[0,T]$ endowed with the weak topology.

Let $\varepsilon>0$ and let K^1_ε be the closed ball of radius ε^{-1} in C^α_t. In addition, choose a uniformly integrable subset of $L^1[0,T]$, denoted $\hat{K}^2_\varepsilon$, such that

$$\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \tilde{\mathbb{P}}(\partial_t I^{2,n}\notin \hat{K}^2_\varepsilon) < \varepsilon.$$

Define K^2_ε to be the anti-derivatives of $\hat{K}^2_\varepsilon$, that is:

$$K^2_\varepsilon = \Big\{ f\in C[0,T] \mid f(0)=0 \text{ and there exists } g\in\hat{K}^2_\varepsilon \text{ such that } \partial_t f = g\Big\}$$

Finally, let K_ε be the algebraic sum (in $C[0,T]$) of K^1_ε and K^2_ε. In view of our decomposition, it follows that

$$\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \tilde{\mathbb{P}}(\langle\Gamma(\tilde{f}_n),\varphi\rangle\notin K_\varepsilon) \le \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \tilde{\mathbb{P}}(I^{n,1}\notin K^1_\varepsilon) + \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \tilde{\mathbb{P}}(I^{n,2}\notin K^2_\varepsilon).$$

Each of the probabilities above are of order ε. Since, by construction, K^1_ε and K^2_ε are equi-continuous subsets of $C[0,T]$, therefore, by Arzelà-Ascoli, it follows that K_ε is itself compact in $C[0,T]$. This completes the proof. □

Lemma 6.9. *The sequence $\{\tilde{f}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ induces tight laws on the space $C_t([L^1_{x,v}]_w)\cap L^1_{t,x}(\mathcal{M}^*_v)$.*

Proof. Let us begin by verifying that $\{\tilde{f}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ induces a tight sequence of laws on $L^1_{t,x}(\mathcal{M}^*_v)$. From the uniform bounds, we know that $\{\tilde{f}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded in $L^1(\tilde{\Omega}\times[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^{2d})$. By the appendix Lemma B.3, it suffices to check that for each $\varphi\in C^\infty_c(\mathbb{R}^d_v)$, the sequence $\{\langle\tilde{f}_n,\varphi\rangle\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ induces a tight sequence of laws on $L^1_{t,x}$. For this purpose, we will the compactness criterion

given in appendix Lemma B.4, together with Lemma 6.8. Indeed, recall the definition of $\Gamma_m(z)$ in equation (51), then for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$, we have the decomposition

$$\langle \tilde{f}_n, \varphi \rangle = \langle \Gamma_m(\tilde{f}_n), \varphi \rangle + \langle f_n - \Gamma_m(\tilde{f}_n), \varphi \rangle.$$

By Lemma 6.8, the sequence $\{\langle \Gamma_m(\tilde{f}_n), \varphi \rangle\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ induces a tight sequence of laws on $L^1_{t,x}$. Hence, by Lemma B.4, it only remains to verify that

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \left\| \langle \tilde{f}_n - \Gamma_m(\tilde{f}_n), \varphi \rangle \right\|_{L^1_{t,x}} = 0.$$

Towards this end, note the elementary inequality: for all $R > 1$ and $z > 0$,

$$|\Gamma_m(z) - z| \leq \frac{R}{m} z + z 1_{z \geq R} \leq \frac{R}{m} z + |\log R|^{-1} z |\log z|.$$

Hence, for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $R > 1$, we have the inequality

$$\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \tilde{\mathbb{E}} \left\| \langle \tilde{f}_n - \Gamma_m(\tilde{f}_n), \varphi \rangle \right\|_{L^1_{t,x}} \leq \frac{R}{m} \|\varphi\|_{L^\infty_v} \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \tilde{\mathbb{E}} \|\tilde{f}_n\|_{L^1_{t,x,v}} + |\log R|^{-1} \|\varphi\|_{L^\infty_v} \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \tilde{E} \|\tilde{f}_n \log \tilde{f}_n\|_{L^1_{t,x,v}}.$$

Taking first $m \to \infty$ and then $R \to \infty$ gives the claim.

The next step is to check that the sequence $\{\tilde{f}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ induces a tight sequence of laws on $C_t([L^1_{x,v}]_w)$. In view of the uniform bounds on $\tilde{f}_n$ and the pointwise estimate (60) used in the proof of Lemma 6.8, the sequence

$$\{(1 + |x|^2 + |v|^2 + |\log|\Gamma_m(\tilde{f}_n)||)\Gamma_m(\tilde{f}_n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$$

is uniformly bounded in $L^1(\tilde{\Omega} \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^{2d})$. In view of the appendix lemma A.4, it suffices to verify that for all $\varphi \in C^\infty_c(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$, the sequence $\{\langle \tilde{f}_n, \varphi \rangle\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ induces tight laws on the space $C[0,T]$. Again, for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$ we have the decomposition

$$\langle \tilde{f}_n, \varphi \rangle = \langle \Gamma_m(\tilde{f}_n), \varphi \rangle + \langle \tilde{f}_n - \Gamma_m(\tilde{f}_n), \varphi \rangle.$$

Moreover, the sequence $\{\langle \Gamma_m(\tilde{f}_n), \varphi \rangle\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ induces tight laws on $C[0,T]$ by Lemma 6.8. Arguing in a similar way as above, we find that

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \left\| \langle \tilde{f}_n - \Gamma_m(\tilde{f}_n), \varphi \rangle \right\|_{L^\infty_t} = 0.$$

Therefore by Lemma B.4 $\{\langle \tilde{f}_n, \varphi \rangle\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is tight on $C[0,T]$. □

6.2 Proof of Proposition 6.1

For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, introduce random variables $\tilde{X}_n, \tilde{Y}_n$, and $\tilde{Z}_n$ by setting

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{X}_n &= \left((1 + |x|^2 + |v|^2 + |\log \tilde{f}_n|)\, \tilde{f}_n, \mathcal{D}_n^0(\tilde{f}_n) \right) \\
\tilde{Y}_n &= \left(\tilde{f}_n, \{\tilde{\beta}_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \right) \\
\tilde{Z}_n &= \left\{ \left(\Gamma_m(\tilde{f}_n), \gamma_m(\tilde{f}_n), \Gamma_m'(\tilde{f}_n) \mathcal{B}_n^-(\tilde{f}_n, \tilde{f}_n), \Gamma_m'(\tilde{f}_n) \mathcal{B}_n^+(\tilde{f}_n, \tilde{f}_n) \right) \right\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}}
\end{aligned}$$

The random variables $\tilde{X}_n, \tilde{Y}_n$, and $\tilde{Z}_n$ induce laws defined on the spaces E, F, and G respectively, where

$$\begin{aligned}
E &= [L_t^1(C_c(\mathbb{R}^{2d}))]_*' \times [\mathcal{M}_{t,x,v}]_* \\
F &= L_{t,x}^1(\mathcal{M}_v^*) \cap C_t([L_{x,v}^1]_w) \times [C_t]^\infty \\
G &= \left[[L_{t,x}^1(\mathcal{M}_v^*) \cap C_t([L_{x,v}^1]_w)]^2 \times [L_{t,x,v}^1]_w^2 \right]^\infty.
\end{aligned}$$

To be clear, we use $[L_t^1(C_c(\mathbb{R}^{2d}))]_*'$ to denote the dual of $L_t^1(C_c(\mathbb{R}^{2d}))$ endowed with the weak star topology.

Our first observation is that the sequence $\{\tilde{X}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ induces tight laws on E. For this, we use the fact that $L_t^\infty(L_{x,v}^1)$ embeds isometrically into the space $L_t^\infty(\mathcal{M}_{x,v})$, which in turn embeds isometrically into $[L_t^1(C_c(\mathbb{R}^{2d}))]'$ by classical duality results on Lebesgue-Bochner spaces. Also, $L_{t,x,v}^1$ embeds isometrically into $\mathcal{M}_{t,x,v}$. Since bounded sets in $L_t^\infty(L_{x,v}^1) \times L_{t,x,v}^1$ are compact in E, the uniform bounds (50) and Banach Alaoglu yield the tightness claim.

Next we observe that $\{\tilde{Y}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ induces tight laws on F. This follows from Lemma 6.9 and classical facts about Brownian motions. Finally, by Lemmas 6.6, 6.7, and 6.8 it follows that the sequence $\{\tilde{Z}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ induces tight laws on G. Combining these observations, we find that the sequence $\{(\tilde{X}_n, \tilde{Y}_n, \tilde{Z}_n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ induces tight laws on $E \times F \times G$.

Apply the Jakubowski/Skorohod Theorem A.2 (working on a subsequence if necessary) to obtain a new probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$, random variables (X, Y, Z) on $E \times F \times G$, and a sequence of maps $\{\tilde{T}_n\}$ satisfying Part 1 of Proposition 6.1. First observe that the uniform bounds and the explicit representation guarantees that $X_n(\omega) \in L_t^\infty(L_{x,v}^1) \times L_{t,x,v}^1$ for almost all $\omega \in \Omega$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus, Part 1 now yields that $\{f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfies the uniform bounds (50) with $\mathbb{E}$ in place of $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}$. This gives the first claim in Part 2 of Proposition 6.1. Theorem A.2 also guarantees that the sequence $\{X_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ defined by $X_n = \tilde{X}_n \circ \tilde{T}_n$ converges pointwise on Ω to X in the space E. In particular, there exists a random constant $C(\omega)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \| (1 + |x|^2 + |v|^2 + |\log f_n(\omega)|)\, f_n(\omega) \|_{[L_t^1(C_c(\mathbb{R}^{2d}))]'} \leq C(\omega). \\
&\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \| \mathcal{D}_n^0(f_n)(\omega) \|_{\mathcal{M}_{t,x,v}} \leq C(\omega).
\end{aligned}$$

Using again the isometric embedding of $L^\infty_t(L^1_{x,v})$ into $[L^1_t(C_c(\mathbb{R}^{2d}))]'$ and $L^1_{t,x,v}$ into $\mathcal{M}_{t,x,v}$, together with the fact that $X_n(\omega) \in L^\infty_t(L^1_{x,v}) \times L^1_{t,x,v}$, this completes the proof of Part 2. To obtain the remaining parts of Proposition 6.1, let $\overline{D}$ be the second component of X, and denote

$$Y = \Big(f, \{\beta_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}\Big).$$
$$Z = \left\{ \Big(\overline{\Gamma_m(f)}, \overline{\gamma_m(f)}, \mathcal{B}^-_m, \mathcal{B}^+_m\Big) \right\}_{m\in\mathbb{N}}.$$

Part 3 follows easily from Part 1 and the martingale representation theorem. Part 4 follows from the pointwise convergence of $\{Y_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ towards Y in the space F. Part 5 follows from the pointwise convergence of $\{Z_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ towards Z and $\{X_n\}n \in \mathbb{N}$ to X. This completes the proof of Proposition 6.1.

6.3 Proof of Corollary 6.3

Proof of Corollary 6.3. Fix an $m \in \mathbb{N}$. The Corollary is proved by using the uniform bounds and the convergence results obtained in Proposition 6.1 to verify the hypotheses of the stability result for martingale solutions of stochastic kinetic equations, Proposition 3.5. Namely, we will analyze the sequence $\{\Gamma_m(f_n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$. Once we verify Parts $1-3$ of Proposition 3.5, we may conclude that the process $\overline{\Gamma_m(f)}$ is a weak martingale solution to the stochastic kinetic equation driven by $\mathcal{B}^+_m - \mathcal{B}^-_m$, starting from $\Gamma_m(f_0)$, with noise coefficients $\sigma = \{\sigma_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$.

To verify Part 1, let us first check that the process $\Gamma_m(f_n)$ is a weak martingale solution to the stochastic kinetic equation driven by $\Gamma'_m(f_n)\mathcal{B}_n(f_n, f_n)$, starting from $\Gamma_m(f^0_n)$, relative to the noise coefficients σ^n and the Brownian motions $\{\beta^n_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ obtained in 6.1. Indeed, $\{\tilde{f}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a renormalized weak martingale solution to the stochastic kinetic equation driven by $\mathcal{B}_n(\tilde{f}_n, \tilde{f}_n)$, starting from f^0_n, relative to the noise coefficients σ^n and the Brownian motions $\{\tilde{\beta}^n_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$. The claim can now be checked by using the explicit expression for $\{f_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $\{\beta^n_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ in terms of the maps $\{\tilde{T}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ together with the fact that $\Gamma_m \in \mathcal{R}'$.

To verify Part 2, from the uniform bounds in Proposition 6.1 and the fact that $\Gamma_m(z) \lesssim z$, it follows that the sequence $\{\Gamma_m(f_n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded in $L^2(\Omega; L^\infty_t(L^1_{x,v}))$. Also, Lemma 6.5 and Part 1 of Proposition 6.1 imply that $\{\Gamma'_m(f_n)\mathcal{B}^-_n(f_n, f_n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $\{\Gamma'_m(f_n)\mathcal{B}^+_n(f_n, f_n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ are uniformly bounded in $L^2(\Omega; L^1_{t,x,v})$. Combining this with the pointwise convergences from Part 5 of Proposition 6.1, we easily verify (26) and (27).

Finally Part 3 follows from the convergences from Part 4 of Proposition 6.1 together with Hypotheses 5.2 and 5.1 regarding the sequences $\{\sigma^n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $\{f^0_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$. □

7 Analysis of the Renormalized Collision Operator

By applying the renormalization lemma for martingale solutions of stochastic kinetic equations, we obtain the following immediate corollary.

Corollary 7.1. *For all $m \in \mathbb{N}$, the process $\log(1+\overline{\Gamma_m(f)})$ is a weak martingale solution to the stochastic kinetic transport equation driven by $(1+\overline{\Gamma_m(f)})^{-1}[\mathcal{B}_m^+ - \mathcal{B}_m^-]$, starting from $\log(1+\Gamma_m(f_0))$, relative to the stochastic basis $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, (\mathcal{F}_t^m)_{t=0}^T)$.*

In this section, we prepare for the passage of $m \to \infty$.

Lemma 7.2. *As $m \to \infty$, the sequence $\{\overline{\Gamma_m(f)}\}_{m\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges $\mathbb{P}$ a.s. to f in the space $C_t(L^1_{x,v})$.*

Proof. We begin by showing that the process $t \mapsto \overline{\Gamma_m(f_t)}$ has continuous sample paths in $L^1_{x,v}$ with the strong topology. Observe that any sequence converging strongly in $L^2_{x,v}$ and weakly in $L^1_{x,v}$ also converges strongly in $L^1_{x,v}$. Therefore, since $\overline{\Gamma_m(f)} \in C_t([L^1_{x,v}]_w)$ with probability one, it suffices to show that $\overline{\Gamma_m(f)} \in C_t(L^2_{x,v})$ with probability one. However, since $\overline{\Gamma_m(f)}$ is a renormalized weak martingale solution to a stochastic kinetic equation (see discussion above) and certainly $\overline{\Gamma_m(f)}$ belongs to $L^\infty_t(L^1_{x,v} \cap L^\infty_{x,v})$ with probability one, we thereby conclude by Lemma 3.9 that $\overline{\Gamma_m(f)} \in C_t(L^2_{x,v})$ with probability one.

To complete the proof, it is now enough to show that $\{\overline{\Gamma_m(f)}\}_{m\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges $\mathbb{P}$ a.s. to f in $L^\infty_t(L^1_{x,v})$. This is accomplished by applying Proposition 6.1 to conclude that for each $t \in [0,T]$, $f_n(t) - \Gamma_m(f_n(t)) \to f_t - \overline{\Gamma_m(f_t)}$ weakly in $L^1_{x,v}$, $\mathbb{P}$ almost-surely, then using weak lower semi-continuity of the $L^1_{x,v}$ norm to obtain the $\mathbb{P}$ almost-sure inequality

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{t\in[0,T]} \|f_t - \overline{\Gamma_m(f)_t}\|_{L^1_{x,v}} &\le \liminf_{n\to\infty} \sup_{t\in[0,T]} \|f_n(t) - \Gamma_m(f_n)(t)\|_{L^1_{x,v}} \\ &\le \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \sup_n \|f_n\|_{L^\infty_t(L^1_{x,v})} + \sup_n \|f_n \mathbb{1}_{f_n \ge \sqrt{m}}\|_{L^\infty_t(L^1_{x,v})},\end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we used the fact that

$$|x - \Gamma_m(x)| \le \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} x + x \mathbb{1}_{|x|\ge\sqrt{m}}.$$

In view of Part 2 in Proposition 6.1, for $\mathbb{P}$ almost all $\omega \in \Omega$, the sequence $\{f_n(\omega)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly integrable in $L^\infty_t(L^1_{x,v})$. Taking $m \to \infty$ on both sides of the inequality above completes the proof. □

Our primary focus is to analyze the limiting behavior of the sequence $\{\mathcal{B}_m^+\}_{m\in\mathbb{N}}$. The main source of difficulty here is that this sequence is not bounded in $L^1(\Omega\times[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^{2d})$. This is natural in the sense that we expect $\mathcal{B}_m^+$ to be close to $\mathcal{B}^+(f,f)$ as we relax the truncation parameter $m\in\mathbb{N}$. In fact, we know that the main strategy in dealing with $\mathcal{B}^+(f,f)$ is to renormalize with $\Gamma'(f)\mathcal{B}^+(f,f)$ before we can hope for an estimate it in $L^1(\Omega\times[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^{2d})$. The main result of this section is the following:

Proposition 7.3. *For any $\phi\in L^\infty_{t,x,v}$ as $m\to\infty$, the following convergences hold:*

$$\left\{\left\langle\frac{\mathcal{B}_m^-}{1+\overline{\Gamma_m(f)}},\phi\right\rangle\right\}_{m\in\mathbb{N}}\to\left\langle\frac{\mathcal{B}^-(f,f)}{1+f},\phi\right\rangle\quad in\quad L^2(\Omega),$$
$$\left\{\left\langle\frac{\mathcal{B}_m^+}{1+\overline{\Gamma_m(f)}},\phi\right\rangle\right\}_{m\in\mathbb{N}}\to\left\langle\frac{\mathcal{B}^+(f,f)}{1+f},\phi\right\rangle\quad in\quad L^2(\Omega).$$

The most challenging part of the analysis is analyzing the positive part of the collision operator. To analyze the $m\to\infty$ limit, we must analyze the consequences of the pointwise (in ω) convergence of $f_n(\omega)$ towards $f(\omega)$ in the space $L^1_{t,x}(\mathcal{M}_v^*)$. In fact, this has not been used so far in the proof.

Lemma 7.4. *As $n\to\infty$, the following convergence holds $\mathbb{P}$ almost surely:*

$$\frac{\mathcal{B}_n^+(f_n,f_n)}{1+\langle f_n,1\rangle}\to\frac{\mathcal{B}^+(f,f)}{1+\langle f,1\rangle}\quad in\quad L^1_{t,x}(\mathcal{M}_v^*).$$

Proof. The proof follows essentially the same manipulations as in [17] and [29], carried out pointwise in $\omega\in\Omega$. We sketch the proof only to convince the reader that the compactness properties obtained in Proposition 6.1 are sufficient to deduce the claim in the same way as for the deterministic theory, without pulling any further subsequences (potentially depending on ω). Let $\varphi\in C_c(\mathbb{R}^d_v)$. We will fix an $\omega\in\Omega$ and mostly omit dependence on this variable throughout the proof. A change of variables yields the identities

$$\begin{aligned}\left\langle\frac{\mathcal{B}_n^+(f_n,f_n)}{1+\langle f_n,1\rangle},\varphi\right\rangle&=\left\langle f_n\frac{\mathcal{L}_n f_n}{1+\langle f_n,1\rangle},1\right\rangle.\\ \left\langle\frac{\mathcal{B}^+(f,f)}{1+\langle f,1\rangle},\varphi\right\rangle&=\left\langle f\frac{\mathcal{L}f}{1+\langle f,1\rangle},1\right\rangle,\end{aligned}\tag{62}$$

where $\mathcal{L}_n$ is the linear operator on $L^1(\mathbb{R}^d_v)$ defined by

$$\mathcal{L}_n f(v)=\iint_{\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{S}^{d-1}}f_* b_n(v-v_*)\varphi'\mathrm{d}v_*,$$

and $\mathcal{L}$ is defined analogously, but with b replacing b_n. Since $\{f_n(\omega)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges to $f(\omega)$ in $L^1_{t,x}(\mathcal{M}^*_v)$ and is tight as an element $L^1_{t,x,v}$, while b_n converges to b in $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{S}^{d-1})$ by Hypothesis 5.3, it follows that

$$\left\{\frac{\mathcal{L}_n f_n}{1+\langle f_n,1\rangle}\right\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \to \frac{\mathcal{L}f}{1+\langle f,1\rangle}, \tag{63}$$

in measure on $[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^{2d}$, pointwise in Ω. Using the pointwise (in ω) uniform bounds obtained on $\{f_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ obtained in Proposition 6.1 together with Young's inequality, we find that the sequence in (63) is uniformly bounded in $L^\infty_{t,x,v}$, pointwise in ω. Applying the second part of the product lemma B.5, we find that

$$\left\{f_n\frac{\mathcal{L}_n f_n}{1+\langle f_n,1\rangle}\right\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \to f\frac{\mathcal{L}f}{1+\langle f,1\rangle} \quad \text{in} \quad L^1_{t,x}(\mathcal{M}^*_v).$$

A density argument and the pointwise (in ω) uniform bounds on $\{f_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ from Proposition 6.1 yields the $\mathbb{P}$ almost sure convergence

$$\left\langle f_n\frac{\mathcal{L}_n f_n}{1+\langle f_n,1\rangle},1\right\rangle \to \left\langle f\frac{\mathcal{L}f}{1+\langle f,1\rangle},1\right\rangle \quad \text{in} \quad L^1_{t,x}.$$

In view of the identities (62), this completes the proof. □

The purpose of the next lemma is to reduce our analysis of $\mathcal{B}^+_m$ to regions where there are no concentrations in $\{f_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$.

Lemma 7.5. *As $R\to\infty$, the following limit holds $\mathbb{P}$ almost surely:*

$$\frac{\mathcal{B}^n_+(f_n,f_n)}{1+\langle f_n,1\rangle}1_{f_n>R}\to 0 \quad \textit{in} \quad L^1_{t,x}(\mathcal{M}^*_v),$$

uniformly in $n\in\mathbb{N}$.

Proof. Let $\varphi\in C_c(\mathbb{R}^d_v)$ be a non-negative function. Fix an $\omega\in\Omega$ and mostly omit dependence throughout the proof. The Arkeryd bound (15) yields the following inequality on $\Omega\times[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^{2d}$: for all $K>1$,

$$\mathcal{B}^+_n(f_n,f_n)\le(\log K)^{-1}\mathcal{D}^0_n(f_n)+K\mathcal{B}^-_n(f_n,f_n).$$

Hence, for almost every $(\omega,t,x)\in\Omega\times[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d$, we find that

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\langle\frac{\mathcal{B}^+_n(f_n,f_n)}{1+\langle f_n,1\rangle}1_{f_n>R},\varphi\right\rangle\\ &\le(\log K)^{-1}\|\varphi\|_{L^\infty_v}\mathcal{D}_n(f_n)+K\left\langle\frac{\mathcal{B}^-_n(f_n,f_n)}{1+\langle f_n,1\rangle}1_{f_n>R},\varphi\right\rangle.\end{aligned}$$

Next we observe that pointwise in Ω,

$$\left\| \left\langle \frac{\mathcal{B}_n^-(f_n,f_n)}{1+\langle f_n,1\rangle} 1_{f_n>R}, \varphi \right\rangle \right\|_{L^1_{t,x}} \leq \|\overline{b}_n\|_{L^\infty_v} \|\varphi\|_{L^\infty_v} \| f_n 1_{f_n>R}\|_{L^1_{t,x,v}}.$$

By Proposition 6.1, $\{f_n(\omega)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly integrable in $L^1_{t,x,v}$ and $\{\overline{b}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded in L^∞_v, passing $R\to\infty$ yields

$$\limsup_{R\to\infty} \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \left\| \left\langle \frac{\mathcal{B}_+(f_n,f_n)}{1+\langle f_n,1\rangle} 1_{f_n>R}, \varphi \right\rangle \right\|_{L^1_{t,x}} \leq (\log K)^{-1} \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \|\mathcal{D}_n(f_n)\|_{L^1_{t,x}}, \tag{64}$$

pointwise in Ω. By Proposition 6.1, there exists a constant $C(\omega)$ such that

$$\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \|\mathcal{D}_n(f_n)(\omega)\|_{L^1_{t,x}} \leq C(\omega).$$

Hence, sending $K\to\infty$ on both sides of (64) completes the proof. □

The next step is to apply Lemma 7.5 to obtain another Lemma written below.

Lemma 7.6. *As $m\to\infty$, the following limit holds $\mathbb{P}$ almost surely:*

$$\frac{\mathcal{B}_m^+}{1+\langle f,1\rangle} \to \frac{\mathcal{B}(f,f)}{1+\langle f,1\rangle} \quad \text{in} \quad L^1_{t,x}(\mathcal{M}_v^*).$$

Proof. Let $\varphi\in C_c(\mathbb{R}^d_v)$ be non-negative. Fix $\omega\in\Omega$ throughout and mostly omit. The first step is to observe that for each fixed $m\in\mathbb{N}$, pointwise in Ω,

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| \left\langle \frac{\mathcal{B}_m^+ - \mathcal{B}^+(f,f)}{1+\langle f,1\rangle}, \varphi \right\rangle \right\|_{L^1_{t,x}} \\ &\leq \liminf_{n\to\infty} \left\| \left\langle \frac{\Gamma'_m(f_n)\mathcal{B}_n^+(f_n,f_n) - \mathcal{B}_n^+(f_n,f_n)}{1+\langle f_n,1\rangle}, \varphi \right\rangle \right\|_{L^1_{t,x}}. \end{aligned} \tag{65}$$

Indeed, this follows from the following two observations. In view of Lemma 7.5,

$$\left\langle \frac{\mathcal{B}_n^+(f_n,f_n)}{1+\langle f_n,1\rangle}, \varphi \right\rangle \to \left\langle \frac{\mathcal{B}^+(f,f)}{1+\langle f,1\rangle}, \varphi \right\rangle \quad \text{strongly in} \quad L^1_{t,x},$$

pointwise in Ω. By Proposition 6.1, $\{\Gamma'_m(f_n)\mathcal{B}_n^+(f_n,f_n)(\omega)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges to $\mathcal{B}_m^+(\omega)$ weakly in $L^1_{t,x,v}$. Since $\{f_n(\omega)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges to $f(\omega)$ in $L^1_{t,x}(\mathcal{M}_v^*)$ and is uniformly bounded in $L^1_{t,x,v}$, it follows that $\langle f_n(\omega),1\rangle$ converges in $L^1_{t,x}$ to $\langle f(\omega),1\rangle$. Hence, $(1+\langle f_n(\omega),1\rangle)^{-1}\to(1+\langle f(\omega),1\rangle)^{-1}$

in measure on $[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^{2d}$ and is uniformly bounded by 1. Therefore, the product lemma B.5 yields the $\mathbb{P}$ almost sure convergence

$$\frac{\Gamma_m'(f_n)\mathcal{B}_n^+(f_n,f_n)}{1+\langle f_n,1\rangle}\to\frac{\mathcal{B}_m^+}{1+\langle f,1\rangle}\quad\text{weakly in}\quad L^1_{t,x,v}.$$

Now the desired inequality follows from the lower semi-continuity of the $L^1_{t,x,v}$ norm with respect to weak convergence.

The next step is to observe that for all $R>1$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\|\left\langle\frac{\Gamma_m'(f_n)\mathcal{B}_n^+(f_n,f_n)-\mathcal{B}_n^+(f_n,f_n)}{1+\langle f_n,1\rangle},\varphi\right\rangle\right\|_{L^1_{t,x}}\\&\qquad\le\left[1-\left(1+\frac{R}{m}\right)^{-2}\right]\left\|\left\langle\frac{\mathcal{B}_n^+(f_n,f_n)}{1+\langle f_n,1\rangle},\varphi\right\rangle\right\|_{L^1_{t,x}}+\left\|\left\langle\frac{\mathcal{B}_n^+(f_n,f_n)}{1+\langle f_n,1\rangle}1_{f_n>R},\varphi\right\rangle\right\|_{L^1_{t,x}}.\end{aligned}\tag{66}$$

Indeed, writing $1=1_{f_n<R}+1_{f_n\ge R}$ and recalling that $\Gamma_m'(x)=(1+\frac{x}{m})^{-2}$, we find the following upper and lower bounds hold pointwise in $\Omega\times[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^{2d}$

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\mathcal{B}_n^+(f_n,f_n)}{(1+\frac{f_n}{m})^2}&\le\mathcal{B}_n^+(f_n,f_n).\\\frac{\mathcal{B}_n^+(f_n,f_n)}{(1+\frac{f_n}{m})^2}&\ge\frac{\mathcal{B}_n^+(f_n,f_n)}{(1+\frac{R}{m})^2}-\mathcal{B}_n^+(f_n,f_n)1_{f_n\ge R}.\end{aligned}$$

Subtracting $\mathcal{B}_n^+(f_n,f_n)$ on both sides, pairing with φ, dividing by $1+\langle f_n,1\rangle$, and integrating over $[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d$ gives the claim.

Using (65), we may pass $n\to\infty$ on both side of (66), pointwise in Ω. Appealing to Lemma 7.4, we find that for each $m\in\mathbb{N}$ and $R>1$, the following inequality holds pointwise in Ω

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\|\left\langle\frac{\mathcal{B}_m^+-\mathcal{B}^+(f,f)}{1+\langle f,1\rangle},\varphi\right\rangle\right\|_{L^1_{t,x}}\\&\le\left[1-\left(1+\frac{R}{m}\right)^{-2}\right]\left\|\left\langle\frac{\mathcal{B}^+(f,f)}{1+\langle f,1\rangle},\varphi\right\rangle\right\|_{L^1_{t,x}}+\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\left\|\left\langle\frac{\mathcal{B}_n^+(f_n,f_n)}{1+\langle f_n,1\rangle}1_{f_n>R},\varphi\right\rangle\right\|_{L^1_{t,x}}.\end{aligned}$$

Passing $m\to\infty$ yields for each $R>1$, pointwise in Ω

$$\limsup_{m\to\infty}\left\|\left\langle\frac{\mathcal{B}_m^+-\mathcal{B}^+(f,f)}{1+\langle f,1\rangle},\varphi\right\rangle\right\|_{L^1_{t,x}}\le\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\left\|\left\langle\frac{\mathcal{B}_n^+(f_n,f_n)}{1+\langle f_n,1\rangle}1_{f_n>R},\varphi\right\rangle\right\|_{L^1_{t,x}}.$$

Finally, sending $R\to\infty$ and applying Lemma 7.5 to remove the peaks completes the proof. □

7.1 Proof of Proposition

Finally, we can apply our lemmas in order to obtain our main Proposition.

Proof of Proposition 7.3. Let us begin with the analysis of the negative part $\mathcal{B}_m^-$. The first point is to observe that for all $\omega \in \Omega$, we may identify $\mathcal{B}_m^-(\omega) = \overline{\gamma_m(f)}(\omega)\overline{b} * f(\omega)$. Indeed, recall that $\{\Gamma_m'(f_n)\mathcal{B}_n^-(f_n, f_n)(\omega)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges to $\mathcal{B}_m^-(\omega)$ weakly in $L^1_{t,x,v}$ by Proposition 6.1. On the other hand, $\{\overline{b}_n * f_n(\omega)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is bounded uniformly in $L^\infty_{t,x,v}$(with a constant depending on ω) and converges in measure on $[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^{2d}$ to $\overline{b} * f(\omega)$. Since $\{f_n\Gamma_m'(f_n)(\omega)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges weakly to $\overline{\gamma_m(f)}(\omega)$ in $L^1_{t,x,v}$, the first part of the product lemma B.5 gives the claim.

Next, by Lemma 7.2, $\overline{\Gamma_m(f)}(\omega) \to f(\omega)$ in $L^1_{t,x,v}$, and by an analogous argument one can show $\overline{\gamma_m(f)}(\omega) \to f(\omega)$ in $L^1_{t,x,v}$. This allows us to deduce that $\mathbb{P}$ almost surely,

$$\left\{\frac{\mathcal{B}_m^-}{1+\overline{\Gamma_m(f)}}\right\}_{m\in\mathbb{N}} \to \frac{B^-(f,f)}{1+f} \quad \text{in measure on} \quad [0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^{2d}.$$

Since $x\Gamma_m'(x) = (1+\frac{x}{m})^{-1}\Gamma_m(x)$, then with probability one $\overline{\gamma_m(f)}(\omega)$ is pointwise dominated by $\overline{\Gamma_m(f)}(\omega)$ for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$. This yields the $\mathbb{P}$ almost sure inequality

$$\frac{\mathcal{B}_m^-}{1+\overline{\Gamma_m(f)}} \leq \overline{b} * f.$$

Vitali convergence, and the fact that $f \in L^2(\Omega; L^1_{t,x,v})$ allow us to complete the first part of the proof.

To treat the positive part of the renormalized collision operator, observe that for each $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$, the Arkeryd bound (15) gives

$$\frac{\Gamma_m'(f_n)\mathcal{B}_n^+(f_n,f_n)}{1+\Gamma_m(f_n)} \leq \frac{1}{\log K}\mathcal{D}_n^0(f_n) + K\overline{b_n} * f_n.$$

Next we pair with a positive $\varphi \in C_c([0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^{2d})$ and pass the $n\to\infty$ limit on both sides of the inequality above and use the convergence of $\mathcal{D}_n^0(f_n)$ to $\overline{\mathcal{D}^0(f)}$ in $\mathcal{M}^*_{t,x,v}$. Using the fact that $(1+\overline{\Gamma_m(f)})^{-1}\mathcal{B}_m^+$ is in $L^1_{t,x,v}$ and taking φ to be suitable approximations of the delta measure allows us to conclude the almost everywhere $\Omega\times[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^{2d}$ inequality

$$\frac{\mathcal{B}_m^+}{1+\overline{\Gamma_m(f)}} \lesssim \overline{\mathcal{D}^0(f)}_{\text{as}} + \overline{b} * f, \tag{67}$$

where $\overline{\mathcal{D}^0(f)}_{\text{as}}$ is the density of the absolutely continuous part of $\overline{\mathcal{D}^0(f)}$.

To finish the proof, we write

$$\frac{\mathcal{B}_m^+}{1+\overline{\Gamma_m(f)}} = \frac{1+\langle f,1\rangle}{1+\overline{\Gamma_m(f)}}\frac{\mathcal{B}_m^+}{1+\langle f,1\rangle}.$$

By Lemma 7.2,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\{\frac{1+\langle f,1\rangle}{1+\overline{\Gamma_m(f)}}\right\}_{m\in\mathbb{N}} &\to \frac{1+\langle f,1\rangle}{1+f} \quad \text{in measure on} \quad [0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^{2d},\\
\left\{\frac{\mathcal{B}_m^+}{1+\langle f,1\rangle}\right\}_{m\in\mathbb{N}} &\to \frac{\mathcal{B}^+(f,f)}{1+\langle f,1\rangle} \quad \text{in} \quad L^1_{t,x}(\mathcal{M}_v^*).
\end{aligned}$$

The product Lemma B.5, along with the $L^1_{t,x,v}$ uniform bound (67) gives $\mathbb{P}$ almost surely

$$\left\{\frac{\mathcal{B}_m^+}{1+\overline{\Gamma_m(f)}}\right\}_{m\in\mathbb{N}} \to \frac{B^+(f,f)}{1+f} \quad \text{in} \quad [L^1_{t,x,v}]_w.$$

In view of inequality (67) and the dominated convergence theorem (in ω), to complete the proof it suffices to show that $\overline{\mathcal{D}^0(f)} \in L^2(\Omega; L^1_{t,x,v})$. To show this, choose $\varphi \in C_c([0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^{2d})$ non-negative. By the convergence of $\mathcal{D}^0_n(f_n)$ in Proposition 6.1, $\{|\langle \mathcal{D}^0_n(f_n)(\omega),\varphi\rangle|^2\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges to $|\langle\overline{\mathcal{D}^0(f)}(\omega),\varphi\rangle|^2$ for almost every $\omega\in\Omega$. It follows by Fatou's Lemma

$$\mathbb{E}|\langle\overline{\mathcal{D}^0(f)}_{\text{as}},\varphi\rangle|^2 \le \mathbb{E}|\langle\overline{\mathcal{D}^0(f)},\varphi\rangle|^2 \le \sup_n \mathbb{E}|\langle\mathcal{D}^0_n(f_n),\varphi\rangle|^2 \le \|\varphi\|^2_{L^\infty_{t,x,v}} \sup_n \mathbb{E}\|\mathcal{D}_n(f_n)\|^2_{L^1_{t,x}}.$$

Since $\overline{\mathcal{D}^0(f)}_{\text{as}} \ge 0$, we may replace φ by a sequence of non-negative functions $\{\varphi_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \subseteq C_c(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $\varphi_k \to 1$ pointwise and monotonically. Then, passing $k\to\infty$ using monotone convergence and using the uniform bounds on $\mathcal{D}_n(f_n)$ yields the result. □

8 Proof of Main Result

Proof of Theorem 1.7. We begin by proving estimates (12). Recall that Proposition 6.1 implies that $\{f_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges to f in $C_t([L^1_{x,v}]_w)$ with probability one. We begin by showing the bound on $(1+|x|^2+|v|^2)f$. Let B_R denote the ball of radius $R>0$ in $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$. It follows that $\mathbb{P}$ almost surely,

$$\|(1+|x|^2+|v|^2)1_{B_R}f_n\|^p_{L^\infty_t(L^1_{x,v})} \to \|(1+|x|^2+|v|^2)1_{B_R}f\|^p_{L^\infty_t(L^1_{x,v})}.$$

By Fatou's Lemma in $(\Omega,\mathcal{F},\mathbb{P})$, we find that

$$\mathbb{E}\|(1+|x|^2+|v|^2)1_{B_R}f\|^p_{L^\infty_t(L^1_{x,v})} \le \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\mathbb{E}\|(1+|x|^2+|v|^2)1_{B_R}f_n\|^p_{L^\infty_t(L^1_{x,v})} < \infty,$$

in view of Part 2 of Proposition 6.1. Sending $R \to \infty$ and applying Fatou's Lemma once more yields

$$\mathbb{E}\|(1+|x|^2+|v|^2)f\|^p_{L^\infty_t(L^1_{x,v})} < \infty.$$

To show the bounds on $f|\log f|$ and $\mathcal{D}(f)$, we recall the proof of Lemma 5.7, where we showed that $\{f_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ satisfies the following entropy equation $\mathbb{P}$- almost surely for each $t \in [0,T]$,

$$\iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} f_n(t)\log f_n(t)\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}v + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathcal{D}_n(f_n(s))\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}s = \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} f_0 \log f_0 \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}v. \tag{68}$$

Since $z \mapsto z\log z$, and $\{f_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \to f$ in $C_t([L^1_{x,v}]_w)$, $\mathbb{P}$ almost surely, then by lower semi-continuity and the non-negativity of $\mathcal{D}_n(f_n)$ the following inequality holds pointwise in $\Omega \times [0,T]$,

$$\iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} f\log f \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}v \le \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} f_0 \log f_0 \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}v.$$

From this point on, we may follow the arguments in Section 2.4 to conclude

$$\mathbb{E}\|f\log f\|^p_{L^\infty_t(L^1_{x,v})} < \infty.$$

To show the bound on the dissipation $\mathcal{D}(f)$, we remark that a modification of the proof of Lemma 7.4 allows us to conclude the $\mathbb{P}$ almost surely

$$\frac{f'_n f'_{n,*}}{1+\varepsilon\langle f_n,1\rangle} \to \frac{f' f'_*}{1+\varepsilon\langle f,1\rangle} \quad \text{in} \quad [L^1([0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^{3d}_{x,v,v*}\times\mathbb{S}^{d-1})]_w,$$

for each $\varepsilon > 0$. Similarly, by the product limit Lemma B.5, we may also conclude that $\mathbb{P}$ almost surely,

$$\frac{f_n f_{n,*}}{1+\varepsilon\langle f_n,1\rangle} \to \frac{f f_*}{1+\varepsilon\langle f,1\rangle} \quad \text{in} \quad [L^1([0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^{3d}_{x,v,v_*})]_w.$$

Notice that the function $(x,y) \mapsto (x-y)(\log x - \log y)$ is convex on $\mathbb{R}^2_+$. Therefore, by lower semi-continuity we may conclude that $\mathbb{P}$ almost surely, for $\varepsilon > 0$

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^T \iiint_{\mathbb{R}^{3d}\times\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \frac{d(f)b}{1+\varepsilon\langle f,1\rangle}\mathrm{d}\theta\mathrm{d}v\mathrm{d}v_*\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}s &\le \liminf_n \int_0^T \iiint_{\mathbb{R}^{3d}\times\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \frac{d(f_n)b}{1+\varepsilon\langle f_n,1\rangle}\mathrm{d}\theta\mathrm{d}v\mathrm{d}v_*\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}s \\ &\le \liminf_n \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathcal{D}_n(f_n)\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}s.\end{aligned}$$

Taking $\varepsilon \to 0$, by the monotone convergence theorem, gives

$$\int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathcal{D}(f)\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}s \le \liminf_n \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathcal{D}_n(f_n)\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}s.$$

Passing $n \to \infty$ on both sides of (68) yields, $\mathbb{P}$ almost surely

$$\iint_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} f_T \log f_T \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}v + \int_0^T \mathcal{D}(f_s)\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}s \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} f_0 \log f_0 \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}v,$$

whereby we obtain the bound

$$\|\mathcal{D}(f)\|_{L^1_{t,x,v}} \leq \|f \log f\|_{L^\infty_t(L^1_{x,v})} + \|f_0 \log f_0\|_{L^1_{x,v}}.$$

Using the bound on $f \log f$ above, gives

$$\mathbb{E}\|\mathcal{D}(f)\|^p_{L^1_{t,x,v}} < \infty.$$

Next, we prove that f verifies the conditions of Definition 1.4. Begin by observing that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\tilde{f}_n$ has the property that for each $(t,\omega) \in [0,T] \times \Omega$, the quantity $\tilde{f}_n(t,\omega)$ is a non-negative element of $L^1_{x,v}$. Since f_n is given explicitly as $f_n = \tilde{f}_n \circ \tilde{T}_n$, it inherits this property. Finally, Proposition 6.1 implies that $\{f_n(t,\omega)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges to $f(t,\omega)$ weakly in $L^1_{x,v}$. Since weak convergence is order preserving, this shows that f satisfies Part 1 of Definition 1.4. Also, by Lemma 7.2, $f : \Omega \times [0,T] \to L^1_{x,v}$ has continuous sample paths.

In view of Definition 3.1 and Remark 3.2, Parts 2 and 3 of Definition 1.4 will follow once we check that for each $\Gamma \in \mathcal{R}$, the process $\Gamma(f)$ is a weak martingale solution to the stochastic kinetic equation driven by $\Gamma'(f)\mathcal{B}(f,f)$, starting from $\Gamma(f^0)$. In fact, the problem can be reduced further.

Let us show that it suffices to verify $\log(1+f)$ is a weak martingale solution driven by $(1+f)^{-1}\mathcal{B}(f,f)$, starting from $\log(1+f^0)$. Assume for the moment this property of $\log(1+f)$ and let $\Gamma \in \mathcal{R}$ be arbitrary. Since we showed $f \in L^2(\Omega; L^\infty_t(L^1_{x,v}))$, it follows that $\log(1+f)$ belongs to $L^2(\Omega \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^{2d})$. Hence, by Proposition 3.8, $\log(1+f)$ is a renormalized solution. We would like to renormalize by a β such that $\beta \circ \log(1+x) = \Gamma(x)$, or equivalently $\beta(x) = \Gamma(e^x - 1)$, but this is not quite admissible in the sense of Definition 3.6 since $\Gamma \in \mathcal{R}$ need not imply boundedness of β''. Instead, we proceed by a sequence of approximate renormalizations $\{\beta_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ where $\beta_k(x) = \Gamma_k(e^x - 1)$ and $\{\Gamma_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ have the following properties: for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, Γ_k is compactly supported (and hence β_k'' is bounded), the pair $(\Gamma_k, \Gamma_k') \to (\Gamma, \Gamma')$ pointwise in $\mathbb{R}_+$, and the following uniform bound holds

$$\sup_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}_+} (1+x)|\Gamma_k'(x)| < \infty.$$

By Proposition 3.8, it follows that $\Gamma_k(f)$ is a weak martingale solution driven by $\Gamma_k'(f)\mathcal{B}(f,f)$. Using the properties of $\{\Gamma_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ and the fact that $f \in L^2(\Omega; L^\infty_t(L^1_{x,v}))$ and $(1+f)^{-1}\mathcal{B}(f,f) \in L^2(\Omega; L^1_{t,x,v})$, it is straight forward to use the stability result, Proposition 3.5, to pass $k \to \infty$ and conclude that $\Gamma(f)$ is a weak martingale solution driven by $\Gamma'(f)\mathcal{B}(f,f)$ starting from $\Gamma(f_0)$.

Thus, it remains to show that $\log(1+f)$ is a weak martingale solution to the stochastic kinetic equation driven by $(1+f)^{-1}\mathcal{B}(f,f)$, starting from $\log(1+f_0)$. For this, we use once more our stability result. Recall that for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$, the process $\log(1+\overline{\Gamma_m(f)})$ is a weak martingale solution to

the stochastic kinetic equation driven by $(1+\overline{\Gamma_m(f)})^{-1}[\mathcal{B}_m^+ - \mathcal{B}_m^-]$, starting from $\log(1+\Gamma_m(f_0))$. First observe that that for all $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$, the sequence $\{\langle \log(1+\overline{\Gamma_m}), \varphi\rangle\}_{m\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges in $L^2(\Omega; C_t)$ towards $\langle \log(1+f), \varphi\rangle$. Indeed, this follows from Lemma 7.2, the almost everywhere inequality $\overline{\Gamma_m} \leq f$, and the estimates (12). Next, for each $t \in [0,T]$ we can use Proposition 7.3 with $\phi = \mathbb{1}_{[0,t]}\varphi$ to conclude that

$$\int_0^t \left\langle \frac{\mathcal{B}_m}{1+\overline{\Gamma_m}}, \varphi \right\rangle \mathrm{ds} \to \int_0^t \left\langle \frac{\mathcal{B}(f,f)}{1+f}, \varphi \right\rangle \mathrm{ds} \quad \text{in} \quad L^2(\Omega).$$

Using these facts together with the stability result Proposition 3.5, we may pass $m \to \infty$ and complete the proof. □

Appendix A

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space and $(E, \tau, \mathcal{B}_\tau)$ be a topological space endowed with its Borel sigma algebra. A mapping $X : \Omega \to (E, \tau)$ is called an "E valued random variable" provided it is a measurable mapping between these spaces. Every E valued valued random variable induces a probability measure on $(E, \tau, \mathcal{B}_\tau)$ by pushforward. A sequence of probability measures $\{\mathbb{P}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ on $\mathcal{B}_\tau$ is said to be "tight" provided that for each $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a τ compact set K_ε such that $\mathbb{P}_n(K_\varepsilon) \geq 1-\varepsilon$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Definition A.1. A topological space (E, τ) is called a Jakubowski space provided it admits a countable sequence continuous functionals which separate points.

Our main interest in such spaces is the following fundamental result:

Theorem A.2. *Let (E, τ) be a Jakubowski space. Suppose $\{\tilde{X}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of E valued random variables on a probability spaces $(\tilde{\Omega}, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ inducing tight laws with respect to the topology τ. Then there exists a new probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ endowed with an E valued random variable X and a sequence of measurable maps $\{\widetilde{T}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$*

$$\widetilde{T}_n : (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}) \to (\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\mathbb{P}})$$

with the following two properties:

1. *For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the measure $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_n$ is the pushforward of $\mathbb{P}$ by $\widetilde{T}_n$.*
2. *The new sequence $\{X_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ defined via $X_n = \widetilde{X}_n \circ \widetilde{T}_n$ converges $\mathbb{P}$ a.s. to X (with respect to the topology τ).*

The next lemma provides a procedure for identifying a continuous, adapted process as a series of one dimensional stochastic integrals.

Lemma A.3. *Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, \{\mathcal{F}^t\}_{t=0}^T, \{\beta_k\}_{k=1}^\infty)$ be a stochastic basis and let $(M_t)_{t=0}^T$ be a continuous $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t=0}^T$ martingale with the quadratic variation process $(\int_0^t |f_s|^2_{\ell^2(\mathbb{N})})_{t=0}^T$. . Moreover, assume that for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ the cross variation of $(M_t)_{t=0}^T$ with β_k is given by the process $(\int_0^t f_k(s)ds)_{t=0}^T$. Under these hypotheses, the martingale may be identified as*

$$M_t = \sum_{k=1}^\infty \int_0^t f_k(s) \mathrm{d}\beta_k(s).$$

The following is a useful tightness criterion for probability measures on $C_t([L^p_x]_w)$.

Lemma A.4. *Let $\{f_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a collection of $C_t([L^q_{x,v}]_w)$ valued random variables. Assume that for all $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d_x \times \mathbb{R}^d_v)$, the sequence $\{\langle f_n, \varphi\rangle\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ induces a tight sequence of laws on $C[0,T]$.*

If $q \in (1,\infty)$ and $\{f_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded in $L^1(\Omega; L^\infty_t(L^q_{x,v}))$, then the sequence $\{f_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ induces tight laws on $C_t([L^q_{x,v}]_w)$.

If $q = 1$ and the sequence

$$\{(1+|x|^2+|v|^2+|\log f_n|) f_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$$

is bounded in $L^1(\Omega; L^\infty_t(L^1_{x,v}))$, then the sequence $\{f_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ induces tight laws on $C_t([L^1_{x,v}]_w)$.

Appendix B

Lemma B.1. *Let F be a Fréchet space. Then $U \subset F$ is precompact in F if for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a compact set $K_\varepsilon \subset F$, such that*

$$U \subset K_\varepsilon + B(0,\varepsilon),$$

where $B(0,\varepsilon)$ is a ρ-ball centered at 0 of radius ε, for a given metric ρ.

We have the following compactness criterion for $L^p_{t,x}(\mathcal{M}^*_v)$.

Lemma B.2. *Let K be a bounded subset of $[L^p_{t,x}(\mathcal{M}^*_v)]_{\mathrm{loc}}$, $p \geq 1$, and let $\{\phi_k\}_{k=1}^\infty \subseteq C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d_v)$ be dense in $C_c(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Define the map $\Pi_{\phi_k} : [L^p_{t,x}(\mathcal{M}^*_v)]_{\mathrm{loc}} \to [L^p_{t,x}]_{\mathrm{loc}}$ by*

$$\Pi_{\phi_k}(f) = \langle f, \phi_k\rangle.$$

Then K is a compact subset of $[L^p_{t,x}(\mathcal{M}^*_v)]_{\mathrm{loc}}$ if and only if $\Pi_{\phi_j} K$ is compact in $[L^p_{t,x}]_{\mathrm{loc}}$ for all $j \geq 1$.

Proof. Let $\{f_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \subseteq K$, since for each $j \geq 1$, $\{\langle f_n, \phi_j\rangle\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is compact in $[L^p_{t,x}]_{\mathrm{loc}}$, by a standard argument we may produce a diagonal subsequence $\{f_{n_k}\}_{k=1}^{\infty} \subset \{f_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ such that $\langle f_{n_k}, \phi_j\rangle$ converges as $k \to \infty$ for each $j \geq 1$. Identify $[L^p_{t,x}(\mathcal{M}_v)]_{\mathrm{loc}}$ with $\mathcal{L}(C_c(\mathbb{R}^d); [L^p_{t,x}]_{\mathrm{loc}})$, the space of bounded linear maps from $C_c(\mathbb{R}^d)$ to $[L^p_{t,x}]_{\mathrm{loc}}$. Since $\{f_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is bounded in $[L^p_{t,x}(\mathcal{M}^*_v)]_{\mathrm{loc}}$, by the uniform boundedness principle for Frechet spaces, these mappings are equcontinuous as elements of $\mathcal{L}(C_c(\mathbb{R}^d); [L^p_{t,x}]_{\mathrm{loc}})$. Since $\{\phi_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ is dense in $C_c(\mathbb{R}^d)$, this equicontinuity implies that for each $\phi \in C_c(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $\{\langle f_{n_k}, \phi\rangle\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ is Cauchy in $[L^p_{t,x}]_{\mathrm{loc}}$ and therefore convergent. This defines a mapping $f : C_c(\mathbb{R}^d) \to [L^p_{t,x}]_{\mathrm{loc}}$, by

$$f(\phi) \equiv \lim_{k\to\infty} \langle f_{n_k}, \phi\rangle.$$

It is a simple consequence of the linearity of $\langle f_{n_k}, \cdot\rangle$ and the boundedness of $\{f_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$, that $f \in \mathcal{L}(C_c(\mathbb{R}^d), [L^p_{t,x}]_{\mathrm{loc}})$, and therefore belongs to $[L^p_{t,x}(\mathcal{M}^*_v)]_{\mathrm{loc}}$. Therefore K is sequentially compact. Compactness of K now follows from the fact that $[L^p_{t,x}(\mathcal{M}^*_v)]_{\mathrm{loc}}$ is a sequential space.

The converse is simple. If K is compact, since Π_{ϕ_j} are continuous, $\Pi_{\phi_j} K$ are compact in $[L^p_{t,x}]_{\mathrm{loc}}$. □

Lemma B.3. *Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space, and let $\{f_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a bounded sequence in $L^p(\Omega \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^{2d})$ for some $p \geq 1$. Then $\{f_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ induces a tight family of laws on $[L^p_{t,x}(\mathcal{M}^*_v)]_{\mathrm{loc}}$ if and only if for all $\phi \in C_c^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d_v)$, the sequence $\{\langle f_n, \phi\rangle\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ induces a tight family of laws on $[L^p_{t,x}]_{\mathrm{loc}}$.*

Proof. Clearly if $\{f_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ induce tight laws on $[L^p_{t,x}(\mathcal{M}^*_v)]_{\mathrm{loc}}$ then for each $\varphi \in C_c(\mathbb{R}^d_v)$, since the mapping $f \mapsto \langle f, \varphi\rangle$ is continuous from $[L^p_{t,x}(\mathcal{M}^*_v)]_{\mathrm{loc}}$ to $[L^p_{t,x}]_{\mathrm{loc}}$, $\{\langle f_n, \varphi\rangle\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is tight on $[L^p_{t,x}]_{\mathrm{loc}}$.

We proceed in the other direction by explicitly constructing sets $(K_\ell)_{\ell>0}$ which are compact in $[L^2_{t,x}(\mathcal{M}^*_v)]_{\mathrm{loc}}$ such that

$$\lim_{\ell\to\infty} \sup_n \mathbb{P}\{f_n \notin K_\ell\} = 0.$$

Let $\{\varphi_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ be a dense subset of $C_c^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d_v)$. Since $\{\langle f_n, \varphi\rangle\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ induce tight laws in $[L^p_{t,x}]_{\mathrm{loc}}$, then there exist compact sets F^j_ℓ in $[L^p_{t,x}]_{\mathrm{loc}}$ such that

$$\sup_n \mathbb{P}\{\langle f_n, \varphi_j\rangle \notin K^j_\ell\} < \ell^{-1}2^{-j}.$$

Define, as in Lemma B.2, $\Pi_{\varphi_j} f = \langle f, \varphi_j\rangle$. Since Π_{φ_j} is continuous, the pre-images $\Pi^{-1}_{\phi_j}(K^j_\ell)$ are closed in $[L^p_{t,x}(\mathcal{M}^*_v)]_{\mathrm{loc}}$. Moreover, let $B_\ell = \{f \in L^p_{t,x,v} : \|f\|^p_{L^p_{t,x,v}} \leq \ell\}$ and define the set

$$K_\ell = \bigcap_{j=1}^{\infty} \left(B_\ell \cap \Pi^{-1}_{\varphi_j} K^j_\ell\right).$$

By Lemma B.2, for each $j \in \mathbb{N}$, $\Pi_{\varphi_j} K_\ell$ is compact in $[L^p_{t,x}]_{\mathrm{loc}}$. Since, by construction, K_ℓ is also bounded in $[L^p_{t,x}(\mathcal{M}^*_\nu)]_{\mathrm{loc}}$, Lemma B.2 implies that K_ℓ is compact in $[L^p_{t,x}(\mathcal{M}^*_\nu)]_{\mathrm{loc}}$. We now compute,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\{f_n \notin K_\ell\} &\leq \mathbb{P}\{f_n \notin B_\ell\} + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}\{\langle f_n, \varphi_j\rangle \notin K_\ell^j\} \\ &\leq \ell^{-1}\mathbb{E}\|f_n\|^p_{L^p_{t,x,v}} + \ell^{-1}\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} 2^{-j}.\end{aligned}$$

By the uniform bounds on $\{f_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, we conclude the proof. □

Lemma B.4. *Let B be a Banach space and $\{X_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of B-valued random variables. Assume that for all $L \in \mathbb{R}_+$ there exists a decomposition*

$$X_n = Y_n^L + Z_n^L,$$

where $\{Y_n^L\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ induces a tight sequence of laws on B. If, in addition, there exists an increasing, unbounded function $\psi : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+$ such that

$$\lim_{L\to\infty} \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E}\psi(\|Z_n^L\|_B) = 0,$$

then $\{X_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ also induces a tight sequence of laws on B.

Proof. Given $\varepsilon > 0$, we must choose a compact set K_ε with uniformly high probability. Begin by choosing a sequence $\{L_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that

$$\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E}\psi(\|Z_n^{L_j}\|_B) \leq \frac{\varepsilon\psi(L_j)}{2^j}.$$

Next, select a compact set E_j^ε such that

$$\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \mathbb{P}(Y_n^{L_j} \notin E_j) \leq \varepsilon 2^{-j}.$$

Now define the compact set

$$K_\varepsilon = \bigcap_{j\in\mathbb{N}} E_j^\varepsilon + B(0, L_j).$$

The compactness can be deduced from the compact plus a small ball lemma. Now we can estimate

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(X_n \notin K_\varepsilon) &\leq \sum_{j\in\mathbb{N}} \mathbb{P}(Y_n^{L_j} \notin E_j^\varepsilon) + \mathbb{P}(\|Z_n^{L_j}\|_B \leq L_j) \\ &\leq \sum_{j\in\mathbb{N}} \varepsilon 2^{-j} + \frac{\mathbb{E}\psi(\|Z_n^j\|_B)}{\psi(L_j)} \\ &\leq 2\varepsilon.\end{aligned}$$

□

The following two product lemmas can be established in a classical way, using Egorov's theorem.

Lemma B.5. *Let $\{f_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $\{g_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be sequences in $L^1_{t,x,v}$. Assume that $\{f_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded in $L^\infty_{t,x,v}$ and converges to f in measure on $[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^{2d}$. Then be have the following:*

1. *If the sequence $\{g_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges to g in $[L^1_{t,x,v}]_w$, then the sequence of products $\{f_ng_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converge to fg in $[L^1_{t,x,v}]_w$.*
2. *If the sequence $\{g_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges to g in $[L^1_{t,x,v}]_w\cap L^1_{t,x}(\mathcal{M}^*_v)$, then the sequence of products $\{f_ng_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converge to fg in $L^1_{t,x}(\mathcal{M}^*_v)$.*

Appendix C

Proof of Lemma 4.4. For convenience we denote the velocity averaged process by

$$\rho^\phi(t,x;\omega)=\langle f,\varphi\rangle(t,x;\omega).$$

Let $\mathcal{F}_x$ denote the Fourier transform in x and let ξ be the corresponding Fourier variable, for simplicity denote $\widehat{f}=\mathcal{F}_x(f)$ and $\widehat{g}=\mathcal{F}_x(g)$. Taking the Fourier transform of both sides of (23) in Itô form gives

$$\partial_t\widehat{f}+iv\cdot\xi\,\widehat{f}+\mathcal{F}_x(\mathrm{div}_v(f\sigma_k\dot{\beta}_k))=\mathcal{F}_x(\mathcal{L}_\sigma f)+\widehat{g}.$$

If $|\xi|\le 1$ we have the simple estimate

$$\mathbb{E}\int_0^T\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}|\xi|^{1/3}|\widehat{\rho}^\phi|^2\,\mathbb{1}_{|\xi|\le 1}\,\mathrm{d}\xi\,\mathrm{d}t\le\|\phi\|^2_{L^\infty_v}\mathbb{E}\|f\|^2_{L^2_{t,x,v}}.$$

To show the $H^{1/6}_x$ estimate, it suffices to consider $|\xi|\ge 1$. We will find it useful to solve this equation with the addition of a damping term on both sides (corresponding to a pseudo-differential operator acting on f in x). Let $\lambda\in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d_\xi)$, we now consider

$$\partial_t\widehat{f}+iv\cdot\xi\,\widehat{f}+\mathcal{F}_x(\mathrm{div}_v(f\sigma_k\dot{\beta}_k))+\lambda\,\widehat{f}=\mathcal{F}_x(\mathcal{L}_\sigma f)+\widehat{g}+\lambda\,\widehat{f}.$$

Solving this via Duhammel, we find

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{f}(t,\xi,v)&=e^{-(\lambda(\xi)+iv\cdot\xi)t}\widehat{f_0}(\xi,v)+\lambda(\xi)\int_0^t e^{-(\lambda(\xi)+iv\cdot\xi)(t-s)}\,\widehat{f}(s,\xi,v)\,\mathrm{d}s\\&+\int_0^t e^{-(\lambda(\xi)+iv\cdot\xi)(t-s)}\widehat{g}(s,\xi,v)\,\mathrm{d}s+\int_0^t e^{-(\lambda(\xi)+iv\cdot\xi)(t-s)}\mathcal{F}_x(\mathcal{L}_\sigma f)(s,\xi,v)\,\mathrm{d}s\\&-\sum_{k=1}^\infty\int_0^t e^{-(\lambda(\xi)+iv\cdot\xi)(t-s)}\mathcal{F}_x(\mathrm{div}_v(\sigma_k f))(s,\xi,v)\mathrm{d}\beta_k(s).\end{aligned}\tag{69}$$

Let $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d_v)$, upon multiplying both sides of (69) by ϕ and integrating in v, we see that the velocity average $\widehat{\rho}^{\,\phi}$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{\rho}^{\,\phi}(t,\xi) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-(\lambda(\xi)+iv\cdot\xi)t}\phi(v)\,\widehat{f_0}(\xi,v)\,\mathrm{d}v \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-(\lambda(\xi)+iv\cdot\xi)(t-s)}\widehat{\Gamma}_0(s,\xi,v)\,\mathrm{d}v\right)\mathrm{d}s \\ &\quad - \sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\int_0^t \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-(\lambda(\xi)+iv\cdot\xi)(t-s)}\mathcal{F}_x(\phi\,\mathrm{div}_v(\sigma_k f))(s,\xi,v)\,\mathrm{d}v\right)\mathrm{d}\beta_k(s)\end{aligned} \tag{70}$$

Where Γ_0 is defined so that

$$\widehat{\Gamma_0}(t,\xi,v) = \phi(v)\left(\lambda(\xi)\widehat{f}(t,\xi,v) + \widehat{g}(t,\xi,v) + \mathcal{F}_x(\mathcal{L}_\sigma f)(t,\xi,v)\right). \tag{71}$$

Note that the v integrals in equation (70), can be written as a Fourier transform in v. We will denote such a Fourier transform in both x and v as $\mathcal{F}_{x,v}$, and denote by η the Fourier variable dual to v. We find

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{\rho}^{\,\phi}(t,\xi) &= e^{-\lambda(\xi)t}\mathcal{F}_{x,v}(\phi(v)f_0)(\xi,\xi t) + \int_0^t e^{-\lambda(\xi)(t-s)}\mathcal{F}_{x,v}(\Gamma_0)(s,\xi,\xi(t-s))\mathrm{d}s \\ &\quad - \sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\int_0^t e^{-\lambda(\xi)(t-s)}\mathcal{F}_{x,v}(\phi\,\mathrm{div}_v(\sigma_k f))(s,\xi,\xi(t-s))\mathrm{d}\beta_k(s) \\ &= I_1 + I_2 + I_3.\end{aligned}$$

The first term, I_1, we can bound

$$|I_1|(t,\xi) \le |\mathcal{F}_{x,v}(\phi\, f_0)(\xi,\xi t)|.$$

For the second term, I_2, we have by Cauchy-Schwartz

$$\begin{aligned}|I_2|^2(t,\xi) &\le \left(\int_0^t e^{-2\lambda(\xi)(t-s)}\,\mathrm{d}s\right)\left(\int_0^t \left(e^{-\lambda(\xi)(t-s)}|\mathcal{F}_{x,v}(\Gamma_0)(s,\xi,\xi(t-s))|\right)^2\mathrm{d}s\right) \\ &\le \frac{1}{2\lambda(\xi)}\int_0^t \left|e^{-\lambda(\xi)(t-s)}\mathcal{F}_{x,v}(\Gamma_0)(s,\xi,\xi(t-s))\right|^2\mathrm{d}s.\end{aligned}$$

The term, $I_3(t,\xi)$ is a Martingale with quadratic variation

$$\int_0^t \sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\left(e^{-\lambda(\xi)(t-s)}|\mathcal{F}_{x,v}(\Gamma_k)(s,\xi,\xi(t-s))|\right)^2\mathrm{d}s,$$

where $\Gamma_k(t,x,v) = \phi\,\mathrm{div}_v(\sigma_k f)(t,x,v)$. We conclude by the BDG inequality that

$$\mathbb{E}|I_3|^2(t,\xi) \le \mathbb{E}\int_0^t \sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\Big(e^{-\lambda(\xi)(t-s)}|\mathcal{F}_{x,v}(\Gamma_k)(s,\xi,\xi(t-s))|\Big)^2\,\mathrm{d}s.$$

and therefore

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}|\widehat{\rho}^{\,\phi}(t,\xi)|^2 \le \mathbb{E}|\mathcal{F}_{x,v}(\phi\, f_0)(\xi,\xi t)|^2 + \frac{1}{2\lambda(\xi)}\mathbb{E}\int_0^t\Big(e^{-\lambda(\xi)(t-s)}|\mathcal{F}_{x,v}(\Gamma_0)(s,\xi,\xi(t-s))|\Big)^2\mathrm{d}s\\ + \mathbb{E}\int_0^t\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\Big(e^{-\lambda(\xi)(t-s)}|\mathcal{F}_{x,v}(\Gamma_k)(s,\xi,\xi(t-s))|\Big)^2\mathrm{d}s.\end{aligned}$$

The following identities can be readily verified

$$\Gamma_k = \phi\ \mathrm{div}_v(\sigma_k f) = \mathrm{div}_v(\phi\,\sigma_k f) - \nabla\phi\cdot\sigma_k f,$$

and

$$\phi\,\mathcal{L}_\sigma f = \nabla_v^2 : (D_\sigma\,\phi\, f) - 2\,\mathrm{div}_v(D_\sigma\nabla\phi\, f) + \nabla_v^2\phi : D_\sigma\, f - \mathrm{div}_v(G_\sigma\,\phi\, f) + \nabla\phi\cdot G_\sigma f,$$

where we have denoted for convenience

$$D_\sigma = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\sigma_k\otimes\sigma_k \quad\text{and}\quad G_\sigma = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\sigma_k\cdot\nabla\sigma_k.$$

This implies

$$\mathcal{F}_{x,v}(\Gamma_k) = i\eta\cdot\mathcal{F}_{x,v}(\phi\,\sigma_k f) - \mathcal{F}_{x,v}(\nabla\phi\cdot\sigma_k f).$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}_{x,v}(\phi\,\mathcal{L}_\sigma f) = -\eta\otimes\eta : \mathcal{F}_{x,v}(D_\sigma\,\phi\, f) - 2i\eta\cdot\mathcal{F}_{x,v}(D_\sigma\nabla\phi\, f) + \mathcal{F}_{x,v}(\nabla_v^2\phi : D_\sigma\, f)\\ - i\eta\cdot\mathcal{F}_{x,v}(G_\sigma\,\phi\, f) + \mathcal{F}_{x,v}(\nabla\phi\cdot G_\sigma f).\end{aligned} \tag{72}$$

Using that $z^p e^{-\lambda z} \le C_p\lambda^{-p}$, where C_p is constant depending on p, we may bound

$$e^{-\lambda z}|\mathcal{F}_{x,v}(\Gamma_k)(s,\xi,z\xi)| \lesssim \lambda^{-1}|\xi|\,|\mathcal{F}_{x,v}(\phi\,\sigma_k f)(s,\xi,z\xi)| + |\mathcal{F}_{x,v}(\nabla\phi\cdot\sigma_k f)(s,\xi,z\xi)|$$

and using the definition of Γ_0, (71), and (72) we can bound

$$\begin{aligned}&e^{-\lambda z}|\mathcal{F}_{x,v}(\Gamma_0)(s,\xi,z\xi)|\\ &\qquad\lesssim \lambda|\mathcal{F}_{x,v}(\phi\, f)(s,\xi,z\xi)| + |\mathcal{F}_{x,v}(\phi\, g)(s,\xi,z\xi)| + \lambda^{-2}|\xi|^2|\mathcal{F}_{x,v}(\phi D_\sigma f)(s,\xi,z\xi)|\\ &\qquad\quad + \lambda^{-1}|\xi||\mathcal{F}_{x,v}(D_\sigma\nabla\phi\, f)(s,\xi,z\xi)| + |\mathcal{F}_{x,v}(\nabla_v^2\phi : D_\sigma f)(s,\xi,z\xi)|\\ &\qquad\quad + \lambda^{-1}|\xi||\mathcal{F}_{x,v}(\phi G_\sigma f)(s,\xi,z\xi)| + |\mathcal{F}_{x,v}(\nabla\phi\cdot G_\sigma f)(s,\xi,z\xi)|.\end{aligned}$$

Integrating $\mathbb{E}|\widehat{\rho}^{\phi}(t,\xi)|^2$ over $[0,T]$ and using the previous two bounds we get for a.e $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\int_0^T |\widehat{\rho}^{\phi}(t,\xi)|^2 \mathrm{d}t \lesssim\ & \mathbb{E}\int_0^T |\mathcal{F}_{x,v}(\phi\, f_0)(\xi,\xi t)|^2 \mathrm{d}t \\
& + \mathbb{E}\int_0^T \int_0^t \Big\{ \lambda |\mathcal{F}_{x,v}(\phi\, f)(s,\xi,(t-s)\xi)|^2 + \lambda^{-1} |\mathcal{F}_{x,v}(\phi\, g)(s,\xi,(t-s)\,\xi)|^2 \\
& + \lambda^{-5}|\xi|^4 |\mathcal{F}_{x,v}(\phi D_\sigma f)(s,\xi,(t-s)\,\xi)|^2 + \lambda^{-3}|\xi|^2 |\mathcal{F}_{x,v}(D_\sigma \nabla\phi\, f)(s,\xi,(t-s)\,\xi)|^2 \\
& + \lambda^{-1} |\mathcal{F}_{x,v}(\nabla_v^2 \phi : D_\sigma f)(s,\xi,(t-s)\,\xi)|^2 + \lambda^{-3}|\xi|^2 |\mathcal{F}_{x,v}(\phi G_\sigma f)(s,\xi,(t-s)\,\xi)|^2 \\
& + \lambda^{-1} |\mathcal{F}_{x,v}(\nabla\phi \cdot G_\sigma f)(s,\xi,(t-s)\,\xi)|^2 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \lambda^{-2}|\xi|^2\, |\mathcal{F}_{x,v}(\phi\, \sigma_k f)(s,\xi,(t-s)\,\xi)|^2 \\
& + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |\mathcal{F}_{x,v}(\nabla\phi \cdot \sigma_k f)(s,\xi,(t-s)\,\xi)|^2 \Big\} \mathrm{d}s\mathrm{d}t.
\end{aligned} \tag{73}$$

Let's remark that, apart from the initial data, the above estimate is comprised entirely of integrals of the form

$$\int_0^T \int_0^t |\mathcal{F}_{x,v}(\phi\, f_0)(s,\xi,(t-s)\xi)|^2 \mathrm{d}s\mathrm{d}t.$$

Following the technique in [9], such integrals can be estimated by changing variables to $(z,s) = (|\xi|(t-s),s)$, using Fubini, applying the classical trace theorem on the one dimensional integral in the z variable, and applying Plancharel. We find that for any $\gamma > (d-1)/2$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^T \int_0^t |\mathcal{F}_{x,v}(h)(s,\xi,(t-s)\xi)|^2 \mathrm{d}s\mathrm{d}t &\le |\xi|^{-1} \int_0^T \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left| \mathcal{F}_{x,v}(h)\left(s,\xi, z\frac{\xi}{|\xi|}\right)\right|^2 \mathrm{d}z\mathrm{d}s \\
&\lesssim |\xi|^{-1} \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (1+|v|^2)^{\gamma} |\mathcal{F}_x(h)(s,\xi,v)|^2 \mathrm{d}v\mathrm{d}s,
\end{aligned}$$

and for the initial data,

$$\int_0^T |\mathcal{F}_{x,v}(\phi\, f_0)(\xi,\xi t)|^2 \mathrm{d}t \lesssim |\xi|^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (1+|v|^2)^{\gamma} |\mathcal{F}_x(h)(\xi,v)|^2 \mathrm{d}v.$$

Applying the above two estimates term by term to (73), we can readily estimate for a.e. ξ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\int_0^T |\rho^{\phi}(t,\xi)|^2 \mathrm{d}t \lesssim\ & M(\xi) \|(|\phi|^2 + |\nabla\phi|^2 + |\nabla^2\phi|^2)(1+|v|^2)^{\gamma}\|_{L^\infty_v} \left\| \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (|\sigma_k|^2 + |\sigma\cdot\nabla\sigma_k|) \right\|_{L^\infty_v} \\
& \times \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\widehat{f}_0(\xi,v)|^2 + \mathbb{E}\int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\widehat{f}(\xi,v,s)|^2 \mathrm{d}v\mathrm{d}s + \mathbb{E}\int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\widehat{g}(\xi,v,s)|^2 \mathrm{d}v\mathrm{d}s \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$M(\xi) = \frac{|\xi|^3}{\lambda(\xi)^5} + \frac{|\xi|}{\lambda(\xi)^3} + \frac{|\xi|}{\lambda(\xi)^2} + \frac{1}{|\xi|\lambda(\xi)} + \frac{\lambda(\xi)}{|\xi|} + \frac{1}{|\xi|}.$$

Choosing $\lambda(\xi) = |\xi|^{2/3}$, (really take $\lambda(\xi) = (\varepsilon + |\xi|^2)^{1/3}$ and take $\varepsilon \to 0$) we conclude that

$$M(\xi) = 3|\xi|^{-1/3} + 2|\xi|^{-1} + |\xi|^{-5/3} =\leq 6|\xi|^{-1/3} \text{ if } |\xi| \geq 1.$$

Therefore

$$\mathbb{E}\int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\xi|^{1/3} |\widehat{\rho}^{\phi}|^2 \mathbb{1}_{|\xi|\geq 1} \, \mathrm{d}\xi \mathrm{d}s \leq C_{\sigma,\phi} \left(\|f_0\|^2_{L^2_{x,v}} + \mathbb{E}\|f\|^2_{L^2_{t,x,v}} + \mathbb{E}\|g\|^2_{L^2_{t,x,v}} \right),$$

whereby the proof is complete using the Fourier characterization of $H^{1/6}_x$. □

References

[1] R. Alexandre and C. Villani. On the Boltzmann equation for long-range interactions. *Communications on pure and applied mathematics*, 55(1):30–70, 2002.

[2] L. Arkeryd. Loeb solutions of the Boltzmann equation. *Archive for rational mechanics and analysis*, 86(1):85–97, 1984.

[3] L. Arkeryd, R. Esposito, R. Marra, and A. Nouri. Stability for Rayleigh–Benard convective solutions of the Boltzmann equation. *Archive for rational mechanics and analysis*, 198(1):125–187, 2010.

[4] K. Asano. On the global solutions of the initial boundary value problem for the Boltzmann equation with an external force. *Transp. Theory Stat. Phys.*, 16(4-6):735–761, 1987.

[5] I. Bailleul and M. Gubinelli. Unbounded rough drivers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1501.02074*, 2015.

[6] C. Bardos, F. Golse, and D. Levermore. Fluid dynamic limits of kinetic equations. I. Formal derivations. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 63(1-2):323–344, 1991.

[7] N. Bellomo, M. Lachowicz, A. Palczewski, and G. Toscani. On the initial value problem for the Boltzmann equation with a force term. *Transp. Theory Stat. Phys.*, 18(1):87–102, 1989.

[8] M. Bixon and R. Zwanzig. Boltzmann-Langevin equation and hydrodynamic fluctuations. *Physical Review*, 187(1):267, 1969.

[9] F. Bouchut and L. Desvillettes. Averaging lemmas without time Fourier transform and application to discretized kinetic equations. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh, Section: A Mathematics*, 129(01):19–36, 1999.

[10] C. L. Bris and P.-L. Lions. Existence and uniqueness of solutions to Fokker–Planck type equations with irregular coefficients. *Communications in Partial Differential Equations*, 33(7):1272–1317, 2008.

[11] Z. Brzeźniak, F. Flandoli, and M. Maurelli. Existence and uniqueness for stochastic 2d Euler flows with bounded vorticity. *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, 221(1):107–142, 2016.

[12] C. Cercignani. *The Boltzmann Equation and Its Applications:*. Applied Mathematical Sciences. Springer New York, 1988.

[13] C. Cercignani, R. Illner, and M. Pulvirenti. *The mathematical theory of dilute gases*, volume 106. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.

[14] M. Coghi and F. Flandoli. Propagation of chaos for interacting particles subject to environmental noise. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1403.1981*, 2014.

[15] A. Debussche and J. Vovelle. Invariant measure of scalar first-order conservation laws with stochastic forcing. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 163(3-4):575–611, 2015.

[16] F. Delarue, F. Flandoli, and D. Vincenzi. Noise prevents collapse of vlasov-poisson point charges. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 67(10):1700–1736, 2014.

[17] R. J. DiPerna and P.-L. Lions. On the Cauchy problem for Boltzmann equations: global existence and weak stability. *Annals of Mathematics*, pages 321–366, 1989.

[18] R. J. DiPerna and P.-L. Lions. Ordinary differential equations, transport theory and Sobolev spaces. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 98(3):511–547, 1989.

[19] R. Duan, T. Yang, and C. Zhu. L1 and BV-type stability of the Boltzmann equation with external forces. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 227(1):1–28, 2006.

[20] R. Esposito, R. Marra, and J. Lebowitz. Solutions to the Boltzmann equation in the Boussinesq regime. *Journal of statistical physics*, 90(5-6):1129–1178, 1998.

[21] E. Fedrizzi, F. Flandoli, E. Priola, and J. Vovelle. Regularity of stochastic kinetic equations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.01088*, 2016.

[22] F. Flandoli. The interaction between noise and transport mechanisms in pdes. *Milan Journal of Mathematics*, 79(2):543–560, 2011.

[23] F. Flandoli, M. Gubinelli, and E. Priola. Well-posedness of the transport equation by stochastic perturbation. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 180(1):1–53, 2010.

[24] R. F. Fox and G. E. Uhlenbeck. Contributions to nonequilibrium thermodynamics. ii. fluctuation theory for the Boltzmann equation. *Physics of Fluids (1958-1988)*, 13(12):2881–2890, 1970.

[25] I. Gallagher, L. Saint-Raymond, and B. Texier. *From Newton to Boltzmann: hard spheres and short-range potentials*. European mathematical society, 2013.

[26] B. Gess and P. E. Souganidis. Long-time behavior, invariant measures and regularizing effects for stochastic scalar conservation laws. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1411.3939*, 2014.

[27] F. Golse, P.-L. Lions, B. Perthame, and R. Sentis. Regularity of the moments of the solution of a transport equation. *Journal of functional analysis*, 76(1):110–125, 1988.

[28] F. Golse and L. Saint-Raymond. Velocity averaging in L1 for the transport equation. *Comptes Rendus Mathematique*, 334(7):557–562, 2002.

[29] F. Golse and L. Saint-Raymond. Hydrodynamic limits for the Boltzmann equation. *RIVISTA DI MATEMATICA DELLA UNIVERSITÀ DI PARMA*, 4**:1–144, 31 Dec. 2005.

[30] M. Hofmanová et al. A Bhatnagar–Gross–Krook approximation to stochastic scalar conservation laws. In *Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincaré, Probabilités et Statistiques*, volume 51, pages 1500–1528. Institut Henri Poincaré, 2015.

[31] P.-E. Jabin and L. Vega. A real space method for averaging lemmas. *Journal de mathématiques pures et appliquées*, 83(11):1309–1351, 2004.

[32] A. Jakubowski. A non-Skorohod topology on the Skorohod space. *Electron. J. Probab*, 2(4):1–21, 1997.

[33] H. Kunita. *Stochastic flows and stochastic differential equations*, volume 24. Cambridge university press, 1997.

[34] L. Landau and E. Lifshitz. Fluid mechanics, 1959. *Course of Theoretical Physics*, 1959.

[35] P. L. Lions. Compactness in Boltzmann's equation via Fourier integral operators and applications. III. *Journal of Mathematics of Kyoto University*, 34(3):539–584, 1994.

[36] P.-L. Lions, B. Perthame, and P. E. Souganidis. Stochastic averaging lemmas for kinetic equations. *Séminaire Laurent Schwartz âĂŤ EDP et applications*, 2011-2012:1–17, 2011-2012.

[37] E. Montroll. *Fluctuation phenomena*, volume 7. Elsevier, 2012.

[38] É. Pardoux. *Equations aux dérivées partielles stochastiques non lineaires monotones: Etude de solutions fortes de type Ito*. PhD thesis, 1975.

[39] H. Spohn. Fluctuations around the Boltzman equation. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 26(2):285–305, 1981.

[40] H. Spohn. Fluctuation theory for the Boltzmann equation. *Nonequilibrium Phenomena I: The Boltzmann Equation*, 1:225–251, 1983.

[41] H. Spohn. *Large scale dynamics of interacting particles*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.

[42] H. Ueyama. The stochastic Boltzmann equation and hydrodynamic fluctuations. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 22(1):1–26, 1980.

[43] S. Ukai, T. Yang, and H. Zhao. Global solutions to the Boltzmann equation with external forces. *Analysis and Applications*, 3(02):157–193, 2005.

[44] A. W. Van Der Vaart and J. A. Wellner. *Weak Convergence*. Springer, 1996.

[45] C. Villani. A review of mathematical topics in collisional kinetic theory. *Handbook of mathematical fluid dynamics*, 1:71–305, 2002.